

THE
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER, 1872.

I.—AMERICAN CIVILIZATION.

IT was a remark of Hare, that "the ultimate tendency of civilization is toward barbarism." In this opinion many distinguished writers concur. Rivarol has said: "The most civilized people are as near to barbarism as the most polished steel is to rust. Nations, like metals, have only a superficial brilliancy."

Whether these statements be entirely true or not, it can not be denied that very much of what we call the superior civilization of the nineteenth century is more in imagination than in fact. Our acts of barbarism may be more scientific than were those of our forefathers, but it is by no means certain they are to be preferred on that account. We think, however, that different nationalities, belonging to the same period of history, are often characterized by very striking differences in their civilizations. And perhaps this fact was never more distinctly apparent than in the present age. We think it can scarcely be doubted that our civilization differs greatly from the civilizations of Europe. Nor should we be surprised at this. True, our people are descendants of European stock; but we are subjected to many new influences here which greatly modify our growth. In some things it is evident we have largely gained on the old civilizations, and in others it is just as evident we have not come up to the standard of

the social, political, and religious life of Europe. A few points of comparison will help us to understand this matter:

1. Our civilization exalts the people; European civilizations exalt the government. This we think is a truthful generalization, and yet it has not received the attention it deserves. In Europe the government is every thing, the people nothing, except so far as they contribute to the support of the government. If the government is all right, the people are happy; but if the government is all wrong, the people suffer. If the government encourages industry, frugality, and temperance, the people will most generally be industrious, frugal, and sober. If, however, the government is characterized by the opposite of these, the people are sure to follow in the way of their leaders.

In this country the case is quite different. Here the national characteristics are formed from the people. Hence, the government will always be affected more or less by the manner in which the people conduct themselves. If the people are virtuous, the government is not likely to go far out of the way. But, on the other hand, if the people are dishonest, it should not be a matter of surprise if we find government officials whose administration of public affairs will not bear the closest scrutiny.

2. This brings us to consider a second distinction, which is marked with perhaps even more clearness than the one we have just noticed. We refer to the *Individualism* of American society, as opposed to the aggregations every-where found in Europe. *Here* the advancement of civilization is in the exact ratio of the elevation of the individual; *there* every thing is made to depend on the movement of classes. This is true alike in State, Church, and social life. We have already seen that, as is the government, so are the people; and as the people represent the aggregation of individual life, it may be just as truly affirmed that, as is the government, so will be the individual character.

Religious life, in the main, in Europe, assumes no individual responsibility. It rests simply in the Church and in the priesthood. It is the aggregation of the few against the individual many. The individual is the creature of the Church, rather than the Church the creature of the individual. Hence, religious character is whatever the Church is, while the individual life counts nothing. If the Church is popular, to be a member of that Church assures your

religious popularity. Individual religious character is almost lost sight of in this doctrine of aggregation.

In this country there is more attention given to the individual life. True, we have not entirely banished from our midst the despotism of ecclesiasticisms. Still, it can not be denied that the dominant idea of American religion is to protect the individual conscience, to develop the individual life, and from the individual character to produce such a Church character as will be honorable to the great Head of the Church.

This fact will serve to explain why so many foreigners are indifferent to the Church when they come to this country. They have been accustomed to have the Church take care of them. In the Old World their religious conscience had been given away. Hence, when they come here, and find no Protestant ecclesiastical organization ready to assume the responsibility of their religious life, they very naturally drift into indifferentism, or else unite their religious fortunes with Roman Catholicism. This is especially true of our German population. The union of Church and State in Germany has filled our country with a class of independent thinkers who practically deny the right of individual action in religious matters, until they are ready to renounce religion entirely. Hence, the tendency of every German in this country is naturally toward either infidelity or the Roman Catholic Church. Could he find a Protestant Church here willing to become responsible for his religious life—a Church where individual conscience is lost in the influence of aggregation—it might be that our German people would not become so entirely infidel, though it is by no means certain that they would be any better Christians.

Again: this difference between the Old and New Worlds is brought prominently to view in what is called social life. In Europe, social standing is regulated by classes. To be an aristocrat, is simply to belong to the aristocracy. To move in the best circles, does not so much depend upon individual worth as upon the letter of introduction you may chance to possess. The measure of this is the measure of social standing, and without this there is little hope that a stranger will attain to any social position in Europe. X. Y. Z. is a member of the "Academy of the Arts and Sciences," or perhaps of the "Pickwick Club," no matter which. This entitles him to recognition;

while Z. Y. X., a man of undoubted ability, culture, and moral worth, finds European society very largely shut against him, simply because he possesses no key to influence, save individual worth. Recently, one of our most distinguished countrymen was made to feel the influence of this fact in European society. Because he failed to observe some of the stereotyped forms of a questionable aristocracy, he was practically denied the most common civilities at one of the European courts.

In America, this thing is widely different. While we are not entirely removed from the power of cabalistic signs in our social life, it is nevertheless true we have made immense progress toward the recognition of individual character; and in so far our civilization is greatly to be preferred over that of Europe.

3. The basic principle of our civilization is peace; that of Europe, war. This statement must be true, else what we have already said is all false. The standing armies of Europe are the aggregations of despotic power that hold in subjection individual freedom. And yet these armies are essential, as long as European civilization is based upon the principle it now is. Any thing else would soon produce anarchy. If the individual is suppressed at all, it must be done effectually; hence, despots must have the power to enforce their tyrannical measures. This is surely not the best system of government; but it is far better than anarchy, and is therefore necessary where the stream of authority can not be turned the other way.

In this country, our success depends largely upon the gradual retirement of military power, and the adoption of pacific means for the adjustment of all national difficulties. We are bold to say that our civilization demands this. In fact, we can not exist long as a nation without fully and heartily adopting this as a principle of our national life. We have already seen that our success as a nation depends upon the elevation of the masses; for, as every man and woman is a determining factor in American life, that life will be affected in the exact ratio as these men and women are educated.

Now, we believe it will scarcely be questioned that war and refinement are not exactly helpmeets of each other. In fact, we think it may be safely said, that a highly educated, polished, and refined people can not perpetuate their civilization by military power.

Especially is this true where the religious element enters so largely into national life as it does in this country.

We think that history furnishes abundant evidence of the truth of this statement. While the Greeks cultivated the "manly arts," as they are termed, and paid attention to the development of physical strength, they were invincible in battle. But when they had been led, by Pericles and other rulers, to a high degree of mental culture, they lost their military prowess, and became easy victims to the superior physical strength and endurance of the rude, warlike nations around them.

The Roman Empire fell in the same way. The basic principle of its civilization was force. It had been built up and perpetuated by the sword. And as it is forever true that "he who takes the sword must perish by the sword," we find that, so soon as the intellectual culture of the people overcame their relish and aptitude for war, they fell under the superior military power of the uneducated and uncultivated barbarians whom every Roman had been taught to despise. The Roman Empire did not fall, as is generally supposed, because the people had no worthy leaders, or because the people themselves had become extravagant, but rather because both rulers and people had risen above that culture in which military power is an essential element of success. The ruin came because it was attempted to perpetuate the empire by warlike means, when the warlike spirit and prowess had departed before a growth in intellectual and social culture which demanded peaceful negotiations as the means by which all difficulties should be solved.

The workings of this same principle may be seen in some of the present nationalities of Europe. Many of the oldest of these are falling into decay, while those that a few years ago were known only for their rudeness, are rapidly coming up into the first importance. Why is this? Is it because France is intellectually feeble, that she is no longer a match for Germany? By no means. It is rather because France has outgrown the possibilities of war to perpetuate her existence. And as she failed to recognize this fact, she failed to adopt the true policy of national ripeness; namely, the solution of difficulties through the instrumentality of enlightened statesmanship. Germany is just now in the war period, and is in the height of her glory. It will not be long before the German civilization will be

turned backward, if the German people do not exchange the arbitrament of the sword for the more enlightened policy of peaceful negotiation.

In our past history as a nation, it may be that peace has not always been possible without dishonor; but in our future, war can not be probable without national weakness; and we do not hesitate to predict that the wisest statesmanship of the future will recognize this fact.* As already remarked, our civilization demands this; and we must adopt it as a principle of action, or break down at once our common school system, cease to educate the masses, or else adopt a despotic form of government, thereby surrendering our individual liberty to the European idea of aggregation.

But if we continue in the course which Providence seems to have so wisely marked out for us, then our national greatness must grow with our culture, and we shall make such changes in the form of our government as will, from time to time, best conserve the interests of the whole people. No one holds in greater reverence the Constitution framed by our fathers, and bequeathed to us as a rich political heritage, than the writer of this article. And yet we do not belong to that class who think it may not be changed for the better. While we think great care should be exercised when dealing with its sacred articles, still the principles which we have noticed as fundamental in our civilization, require that it shall be changed, as our intellectual, political, and moral progress shall become more and more decided. No human instrument can be framed, in one age, to meet all the exigencies of another. This is the fault of human creeds in religion. The sixteenth century can not decide what shall be orthodox in the nineteenth. Such a thing is just as impossible as the attempt to make the navigation of 1492 just equal to the navigation of to-day.

4. Perhaps there is nothing that distinguishes our civilization more than our religious development. In almost all the countries of Europe, religion is the creature of the State. While the Church is ostensibly managed by religious functionaries, it is really managed by civil authority. This is one of the most blighting influences on

* We look upon the Geneva Conference as one of the most hopeful signs of the present age. Though it has been attended with many embarrassing difficulties, still it is the inauguration of a policy which, if faithfully adhered to, will mark a new era in the history of civilization.

European society. It is, in fact, the fountain whence a thousand poisonous streams flow into both Church and State.

In this country, however, the State and Church are broadly distinctive things. The State attends to its own affairs, while religion is left, where it rightly belongs, to the individual conscience. This complete freedom in our religious life is one of the most prolific sources of our national prosperity. While it is unquestionably attended with some very obvious evils, it can not be denied that here is where some of the noblest inspirations of American life find their starting-place. Soul-freedom is the first thing to be aimed at in any religious development worthy of the name. No matter what may be our intellectual growth, our social respectability, and our political power, we shall fail in the elements of a true civilization, if we do not preserve with scrupulous fidelity the religious freedom vouchsafed to us by the founders of our Government. This feature of our present Constitution we regard as one of the most important things in it; and we should hesitate a long time before we allow it to be tampered with by plausible sectarian fanatics, or well-meaning religious enthusiasts.

We do not wish to be misunderstood at this point. 'It is readily conceded that there is a point of contact between human government and religion. Hence, it is clearly impossible to separate them entirely. Nor would it be wise to do so, even were it possible. A government without the sanctions of religion would scarcely answer the ends of society, and a religion without the forms of human government is not likely soon to be realized. Hence, we do not object to the co-operation of these, where such co-operation is necessary and fruitful in the best interests of society. It is the assumption of prerogatives which do not belong to either, or else the interference of one with the legitimate prerogatives of the other, to which we object. In America, we think the relations of religion and government are well understood, and in this respect our civilization is more promising than any of the civilizations of Europe.

We come now to consider some of the evils of our American civilization, and to notice some of the dangers to which we are exposed.

We think it is characteristic of the American people that they do not think seriously. As a class, they are intelligent, and generally

discuss matters with a good deal of readiness and skill; but they do not think profoundly, and, above all, do not weigh things with that serious earnestness which is essential to a correct solution of the great problems of human life and destiny. Our people are too active for sober reflection. Men live here too much in the present, to allow them to study with calmness the lessons of history, and appropriate these so as to meet the future wisely, with a courage which experience only can give.

We are conscious, however, that Americans will not believe us when we tell them this; for the very fault we have indicated is the parent of a self-satisfaction and conceited wisdom which always utterly refuse to hear any thing but laudation of our national greatness and individual excellences. If any one doubts this statement, let him listen to a few of our Fourth of July orations. These furnish a fair index to our self-appreciation.

We are not unconscious of the fact that this is a pleasant sort of feeling. It is, doubtless, quite comfortable to imagine that we have about reached perfection; but it might be healthier for us if we would seriously ask the question, Is it true? It is one thing to imagine such a state; and it is quite another to find it actually realized in our experience.

We think it may be safely stated that, as a nation, we have been intoxicated for the last twelve years. During the war, this abnormal excitement reached its highest degree. Since then, we have been sobering down somewhat, but the prospect for a return to a perfectly sober state is by no means flattering. The exhibitions of gold-gamblers in New York city, and the general demoralization of municipal affairs in that metropolis, are indications which show the state of the national pulse. Surely, we can not be in a normal condition when a few reckless money-changers can seriously threaten our whole financial system with irretrievable ruin, and when a few unprincipled officials can set at defiance all public honesty, and continue to rob the treasury in the name of public justice.

This, however, is not the worst of it. It is certainly bad enough to have our currency ranging many degrees above a healthy pulse, but it is still more fearful to have the public mind and heart pitched on the same level. This disease manifests itself in our politics, literature, and religion; and we now invite attention to a brief consid-

eration of these, that we may the better understand whither we are drifting.

On the subject of our politics we have only a few remarks to make. In fact, any truthful representation of matters here would be but repetition of facts and incidents that are coming to light every day. We have no heart to speak of the wholesale corruption which everywhere manifests itself in our public affairs. Nor is it worth while to waste time and patience by portraying the fearful fact that the people are rapidly losing faith in the present form of our government. These things are well known; and they are surely not very comforting facts to those who are looking for the millennium to be ushered in under the glorious ensign of American liberty. We can not say that we sympathize with those who have lost hope; but we will say that the evils which are now upon us can be removed only by beginning at once the work of reform. We say at once, because there is no time to lose. The people are already becoming demoralized under the influence of their leaders, and will soon be powerless to relieve themselves from the impending dangers. We have faith in our government. It has already shown itself capable of great things. We believe also that God has shown his special favor for it, and will still bless us abundantly in all things, if we will but be faithful to the important trust he has committed to our hands. But we have no sort of confidence in the perpetuity of our Government, unless we fulfill the conditions of the human side of the question. We must demand of our public men an exhibition of virtue, honesty, and all the characteristics that enter into a good government. We must not only demand this, but we must continue no one in public office who does not seek to meet these conditions. And, above all, we must ourselves set our rulers an example in all that belongs to truth and soberness, and we can then hope that God will continue his mercies to us.

It should be understood that our salvation as a nation does not depend so much upon who shall be elected President at this or any other election, as it does upon the character of the people themselves. A Presidential election may furnish us an index to this character; but the fortunes of our country are not in the hands of any one man. Hence, it is much more important that the people should have a proper sense of the responsibilities of citizenship, than that Grant or Greeley should be elected President.

If we wish to understand the demoralizing tendencies of the times, we need only become acquainted with the literature which furnishes the staple reading for a large majority of our people. While it can not be denied that there is a very considerable demand for useful books, periodicals, and papers, it is nevertheless a fact of fearful import, that fully nine-tenths of the literature purchased in our public markets is in perfect keeping with our national intoxication; and is intended to feed the flame which is already, by far, too fervent for our national life. Our reading is not accompanied with reflection. It is intended only as a sort of opiate to lull the pain of business anxiety. Our popular literature is feverish, and gives us abnormal views of life. But this is what the people want; and, hence, the supply is created to meet the demand. The people want a literature that will make their nerves tingle, and that they can taste on the tongue. It must be sensational in the highest degree, or it will generally fail to awaken any interest. True, a false, inflated, and vicious public press will do much to keep up the abnormal state of the public mind; but it is a fact, nevertheless, that the public press is, in a very great degree, the creature of the popular will, and takes on the very characteristics which the people prefer. Hence, we can not expect a reformation in our books, periodicals, and papers, until the popular taste is such as to demand a change. The press has become a great money-making engine, and, in order that it may find sale for its wares, it must cut them according to the popular demand. Surely, we have fallen upon evil times, when our very intellectual *pabulum* is tainted by the avaricious lust for filthy lucre.

Nowhere, perhaps, does this demoralization manifest itself more decidedly than in our Sunday-school literature. It does seem that the young heart, while seeking the house of God in order to receive religious instruction, ought to be spared from the reckless venders of sensational literature. But one has only to look through our Sunday-school libraries to be convinced that what ought to be an instrument for good is rapidly becoming a most potent influence for evil. Fully nine-tenths of the books, in a majority of Sunday-school libraries, are simply worthless trash.

We fully understand what will be said in reply to all this. It will be said that such books as contain useful instruction are not the books sought for by Sunday-school scholars. These remain in the

libraries, and are seldom, if ever, used. This is undoubtedly true; for children are not wholly unlike grown people. But is this a reason why the evil should be continued? Because children have a taste for forbidden fruit, is that a reason why their appetite should be gratified? Surely, this is strange logic to come from those who profess to reverence the Book which teaches that parents should bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Too much self-gratification is one of the sins of American life; and this habit is not likely to be diminished until our children are taught the wholesome lesson of self-denial. We realize the importance of having our Sunday-school literature gauged according to the capacity of the youthful mind; but it does not follow from this, that its principal ingredient should be poison for the human soul.

And now what shall we say of religion? Does it partake of the national degradation? Is it also a slave to the infernal money-loving spirit of the age? Surely, this ought not to be so; but that it is so, in a very large degree, will not, we presume, be seriously questioned by any intelligent and right-thinking people. There is one thing that must be perfectly evident to any one who will carefully examine the present state of religion in the United States. It must be evident that there is a want of vital piety in those who profess to be the followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. Conformity to the world is now the general rule, while devotion to Christ is the exception. Even the ordinances of Christ have become invested with a sort of worldly grandeur. The baptismal service, in many of the Churches, is frequently accompanied by such a display of tinsel drapery and scenic representation as to largely neutralize its spiritual meaning, both to him who receives it, and to the audience who witness the performance. The marriage ceremony, which is now almost universally performed in the name of religion, and not unfrequently in our Christian Churches, is rapidly becoming an ostentatious, worldly, and godless thing. This sacred institution is no longer an appeal to the spiritual natures of the parties seeking its blessings, but furnishes an occasion for the development of worldly taste, unsanctified ambition, and unholy purposes. The simple, sweet, and beautiful service of faith, hope, and love, has given place to a stilted, formal exhibition, characterized by the "lusts of the eye, the lusts of the flesh, and the pride of life." These are straws which show which way the wind is

blowing; they are clear indications which tell us the direction of the current in which we are drifting.

Of course, it will be understood that we are dealing with extreme cases. We are dealing only with what seems to be the general tendency. That there is still much in our intellectual, social, and religious life of the highest value, is not for once to be questioned; but it will scarcely be affirmed that the picture we have given is overdrawn, as a representation of the growing habits of our American civilization.

There is yet another danger which we wish to call attention to; and this is perhaps the most threatening of any to which we are exposed. We refer to the antagonism between Labor and Capital.

It will scarcely be doubted by any intelligent observer of passing events, that we are rapidly reaching a crisis on this subject. In Europe, the possibilities of such a conflict are largely diminished, on account of the power of aggregation over that of individualism; for this question is really the question of the aggregation of the few against the individual many. In this country, however, the power of individualism is so strong, that it enters a constant protest against all corporations in which the individual has no voice. And as, from the very nature of our American society, the tendency toward these corporations is very general, it is quite natural that a conflict should be precipitated at this point, and it is also quite probable that this conflict will work disastrous consequences to our civilization.

As a people, Americans theoretically ignore European aristocracies. We profess to have little patience with the aristocracy of letters, and still less with the aristocracy of blood; but we are in danger of rearing, in their stead, what is infinitely worse than either, an aristocracy of money. Already we are feeling the influence of some of the vast moneyed corporations of our country. Railroads are surely great blessings, if made to conserve the interests of the whole people; but when our railroad corporations are used for the purpose of influencing legislation, and when our legislative assemblies are no longer equal to withstanding the influence of our railroad kings, it is high time, we think, that every American should ask, How much better is all this than the despotisms of Europe? And the very asking of this question suggests the intensity of the struggle which must soon come out of the antagonism we have indicated,

unless some effectual remedy can be offered. Already we hear mutterings of the coming storm. The formation of "trade-leagues," and the numerous "strikes" which have recently taken place, all indicate the certainty of an impending crisis. It is useless for us to waste time in self-glorification while these facts are staring us in the face. Unless something is done, we shall learn, when it is perhaps too late, that our dream of security was fatal.

We think it may now be properly asked, Can any thing be done to remedy these growing evils? With so many strong points in our civilization, we ought surely to guard against such points of weakness as we have indicated. It may be impossible to meet all the conditions of the case, but we are inclined to think that an honest, earnest effort in the right direction could scarcely fail to do much good. What, then, must be done?

Père Hyacinthe, in one of his admirable discourses, enumerates the essential laws of civilization, as follows: The Law of Love in the Family; the Law of Labor in the Field; and the Law of Prayer in the Temple. Whether this generalization be exhaustive or not, it is certainly highly suggestive. We shall therefore adopt it for our present purpose, with such modifications as may seem necessary.

Let us say, then, that in order to meet the dangers already enumerated, we must seek for such an understanding of the laws referred to as will enable us to hold our American civilization to a normal development.

1. *We must have a very decided reformation in our home-life.* It is unquestionably true that no other people on earth have more respect for home influences than the people of this country. In fact, our appreciation of family relations is one of our distinguishing characteristics. Still, it can not be disputed that this is too often a mere sentiment, rather than a practical force in the development of society. Neither can it be denied that home influence is becoming less and less a factor for good in American life. We sometimes laugh at the rude manners and uncultured dialect of the people forty and fifty years ago; but it is by no means certain that the home-life of to-day develops one-half the sanctified influence that it did then.

We need to cultivate more respect for the sacred relations of the family. Husbands and wives, parents and children, should be made to feel that these relations carry with them obligations to God and

society which can not lightly be set aside. Here is where we ought specially to feel the power of woman's influence. There is no place where she wields such imperious control as in the family circle. Hence, it is to our wives, mothers, and sisters, that we must look for proper direction in this matter. If they fail to do their whole duty, it is idle to hope that many of the evils of our American life, to which we have referred, can ever be eradicated. The stream can not rise higher than the fountain; and as home-life is the fountain of society, we must make *that* what it should be, in order that *this* may be what we desire. Women largely control the first. Hence, it is not difficult to see that they may be powerfully instrumental in reforming the abuses to which we have called attention.

Under this head, Père Hyacinth euses language which Americans would do well to heed. He says :

"I have spoken before now about love in the family—quite too much about it, some people say. I am only sorry that I have not said more. To exhibit the indissoluble union between love and the family, is the noblest and most needed task that any earnest man, and especially any priest, can set himself. For my part, I have never been able to put myself into the position of those theologians, with neither heart nor genius, who ignore this great sentiment of the human soul, and are afraid, apparently, to pollute their lips by uttering its name. I make bold to declare, that it is such men as these who have unconsciously prepared the way for the dynasty of those conscienceless writers who, separating, after their fashion, passion from duty, extol love without comprehending its true dignity, and inflict upon it that supreme outrage of confounding it with caprice and lust. Except when it fixes its undivided gaze upon heaven, and becomes virginity, love can not blossom, save in the sanctuary of home, with that twofold bloom, so beautiful and yet so serious and holy, marriage and parentage.

"However, I have no occasion, just now, to recur to this important subject. I will only observe that, in all prosperous nations, public life is subordinate to private life. This is true not only in this sense, that the State, having for its mission to protect the rights of the family, holds toward it the relation of means to end, and that the means is necessarily subordinate to the end; but in this higher sense, that the citizens themselves concentrate in their homes the noblest of their activities, convinced that, as the best and worthiest service to humanity is attained by serving it in one's own country, so one may best serve and love his country in his family. There, most of all, is played the drama of human life, intense and ravishing as the best passions of the heart, grave as duty, active as the pursuit of interest (which is itself a duty), calm and recollected as study and prayer. It is, therefore, to impel any people in a direction full of falsehood and peril, to hold exclusively, or even principally, before it the prospects of the political career. Doubtless, the life of a great nation is at the polls and in the legislature; but, far more than this, it is at the fireside. When shall we find philosophers to teach us this, authors and artists to depict it?—where, above all, the men to

live it? Ah! look beyond the Alps, at our little neighbor, Switzerland, home of toilsome industry and of the household, of simple, honest, happy life—home, too, of free, traditional democracy! And here, poor French democracy, despising the family, despising religion, here thou art lying yet, after eighty years, crying, helpless, in thy bloody swaddling-clothes!"

Again: it is quite evident that our home-life needs to be characterized by more simplicity and economy. We are surely living in the florid period. Nearly every thing is overdone. Architecture, literature, dress—in fact, all the manifestations of our intellectual, social, and even religious life—show unmistakable tendencies toward the wildest extravagance. We have certainly given a new meaning to Wordsworth's

"Plain living and high thinking;"

for we now practice high living and plain thinking. It is quite useless to particularize, when this tendency is so prominent a feature in every department of society. And yet we can not pass from this portion of our subject without a remark or two concerning our extravagance in dress. An American traveling in Europe can not fail to notice the difference between that country and ours in this respect. There every thing is simplicity; here every thing is extravagance. Very little, if any, jewelry is worn by the ladies of Europe, except on occasions when full dress is expected; but here every shop-girl must parade her jewelry, even while engaged at her ordinary business. Passing from Paris and London to New York, nothing is more striking than the character in dress which is manifest on the streets and in the places of business. It is no longer any wonder that the most extravagant goods manufactured in Europe are imported into this country for sale.

But this is not all. Our ladies are not satisfied with extravagant outlays in this regard, but they are quite ready to adopt the most hideous fashions. Hence, we find them assuming shapes which would be fearful to think of were they to be reckoned among the facts of natural development. Our ladies certainly do not imitate the ladies of Athens. It is said that these were not gaudily but simply arrayed, and yet it is doubtful whether any ladies ever excited more admiration. The same was true of the noble old Roman matrons. These were always very plainly dressed, but were no less certain on this account to be gazed on delightedly by men in every

way worthy of them. Knowing as we do the influence of gaudy attire, we do not wonder that Lysander refused the rich garments that the tyrant Dionysius proffered to his daughters, saying that "they were fit only to make unhappy faces more remarkable."

There must be a radical reformation in this respect; and this should begin at once, and begin at the only place where it will effect any permanent results. The home circle must first be reformed, before we can hope to reform society in general, or bring our rulers to understand the value of a rigid political economy.

While we insist upon reformation in our home-life, it is readily confessed that, in order to have this, we must insist just as earnestly for reformation in the character of the education which our people receive in the schools and colleges of the country. We can not now enter upon this subject as fully as its importance demands, but will call attention to one or two points of special interest.

Horace Mann has truly said that "education is our only political safety. Outside of this ark, all is deluge." And Theodore Parker has just as truly said that, "in this country, every one gets a mouthful of education, but scarcely any one a full meal." Now, if both of these sayings are true—and we think no one will seriously doubt them—then it follows that we have not yet reached one of the principal means of our national safety.

We think it can not be questioned that education in this country is too superficial. Of course, there are many reasons that could be assigned for this, some of which might call for a reformation in our schools and colleges. Still, we apprehend, the chief cause may be found in the present characteristics of American life. We have already stated that we live too rapidly for mature reflection, and this at once suggests why it is that our education is generally so superficial. We are in too much of a hurry to wait on a proper development. Hence, our education bears all the marks of abnormal growth, or else is cut short in the very beginning by a failure of the physical to endure in one year what would be sufficient labor for three.

These remarks are especially true of our female education. It seems to us that, in this, the aim is not very high, to begin with. Very few persons seem to think that our women should receive any more or any better education than is absolutely necessary to fit them for what is commonly called society. But we have already seen that

this society does not require a very high standard. In fact, this is just what needs to be elevated. But if our women, who of all others have the power to make society what it ought to be, are to be educated *for* society, so that society shall control them, rather than that they shall control society, it is clear that there can be no consistent progress made, and, consequently, our civilization can never advance much beyond the points of weakness we have indicated. What we claim for our women is such an education as will enable them to become true reformers, so that society may be led up from its present state to a better and more consistent culture. Need we ask if the present standard of female education is sufficient for this? Every one who has thought seriously upon the subject knows that it is not, and it is quite useless to find fault with the colleges; these are often helpless in the matter of introducing improvements. While parents are unwilling that their daughters shall spend more time than a year or two in securing an education, our colleges must either accept the situation or else prepare for the funeral of all their pupils. But this "situation" is just equal to the development of a young lady, whose proficiency in mathematics and belles-lettres is fitly described by the phrase "hope deferred," and whose musical *pretensions* are generally *sharp*, but whose *real* attainments are always decidedly *flat*. This thing must be changed. We say to fathers and mothers, it must be changed. If we wish a normal development of our future civilization, those who have in their hands the destiny of rising generations must receive such an education as will qualify them to lead the people to a higher and nobler plane of life.

Then let it be understood, that our hot-bed system of education shall give place to a more rational and consistent development. Let our daughters understand that they are not *young ladies* until they are at least *women*, and that they are not worthy women until they are old enough, wise enough, and brave enough to fill the responsible sphere in which, by the highest demands of society, they are called upon to act. When our *parlors* are thus protected from the vicious influences of immaturity, when our home-life shall be sanctified by the reflex influences of a normal education, and when our colleges become the sources of womanly and manly inspirations, and the means of a normal mental, physical, and moral development, we can then begin to hope that our civilization will take on a new type, and that

our advancement, as a people, will be somewhat commensurate with our present high expectations.

2. We come now to consider the Law of Labor in the Field, or, rather, the Law of Labor; for Hyacinthe's statement is clearly too circumscribed, since it must be evident to all reflecting minds that the law of labor *every-where* is an essential element of civilization. Agriculture in this country has, certainly, very great influence upon the development of our national life. No country on earth presents more favorable opportunities for agricultural pursuits, and our people have not been slow to recognize these advantages and profit by them. Hence, it may be truly said that, in our past history, we have been chiefly an agricultural people. But now other branches of industry are rapidly coming up into the foreground. The mechanic arts, especially, will soon occupy, if not the first place, at least a very important place in all that belongs to our development as a people. Railroads, steamboats, and telegraphs are no mean civilizers. But, as we have already seen, these and kindred instruments of good are likely to engender a warfare between capital and labor which may result fatally to our best interests. Hence, one of the great problems of the present day is to determine how to meet this threatening danger.

It should be observed that city life is rapidly assuming an importance in this country which it did not once possess. These cities are the centers of capital, and wield an influence upon the affairs of the nation which is simply incalculable. But these cities contain, also, within themselves, many of the laboring classes who, through trade-unions and other organizations, are rapidly precipitating the conflict between capital and labor. Now, it seems to us that both of these classes, the capitalist and laborer, are needed in order to our proper development. Hence, neither should be destroyed, but such an adjustment made between them as will best conserve the interests of both. Is such an adjustment possible? We think so. We think that Mr. Charles Francis Adams, Jr., in his recent Fourth of July oration, in Boston, gives us the true solution of this matter. Let labor and capital become co-operants. In other words, instead of capitalists paying a salary for labor, let all the laborers share in the profits and loss of every enterprise, then we shall no longer have strikes for higher wages, or for a reduction in the time for work. But instead thereof, we shall have a rapid development of our civilization under

the harmonious co-operation of capital and labor. We shall then see individualism and aggregation co-ordinates in our national life, while railroad monopolies and moneyed aristocracy will no longer usurp authority in either our social or political affairs.

3. Let us consider the Law of Prayer in the Temple, or, in other words, religion, as a factor in a people's civilization. We have already had occasion to quote from Père Hyacinthe. We quote still further from the same distinguished author:

"The law of the family and the law of labor yield their rich delights only at cost of many sacrifices; and to these, men would not long submit but for the help of religion. The law of prayer, binding in itself, is more binding in view of these two other laws, the fulfillment of which it secures.

"I like facts, especially the sort of facts in which we find at once poetry, morality, and utility. Permit me, then, to refer once more to the example of that little population of Basques, on whose frontiers I passed my childhood. Thanks to their isolated dwellings, their old traditionary freedom, larger and more practical than our modern liberties, thanks especially to their inherited morality and religion, the Basques, in a mountain country little suited for tillage, have realized the ideal of rural life. Under that Biscayan sky—the murkiest sky of Spain—they present the rare spectacle of a contented and happy people, disdaining wealth, but never knowing poverty. So perfect is the security which prevails among them, that the cattle and crops lie in the fields without fear of robbers, being (as some one finely says) under guard of the Eighth Commandment."

The lecturer insists at length on the observance of the Lord's-day, as the realization of the social law of prayer. The Lord's-day, kept by the country people in worship and festivity, in the double sanctuary of Church and home, is the badge of civilization. On the contrary, in our great cities, the Sabbath violated with labor and blasphemy, and the Monday given over to drunken festivity, are symptoms of the most abject barbarism.

In all this there is certainly much food for reflection. In this country we are in constant danger of going, religiously, to one of two extremes; namely, Roman Catholicism or German Rationalism. Either of these would be largely fatal to the development of a true civilization. In proof of this affirmation, we need only refer the reader to the condition of those countries where religion takes on these forms. For instance, compare the Catholic civilization with the Protestant; the superiority of the last over the first is unquestionable. And if we want an exhibition of the influence of modern infidelity as a factor in the civilization of a country, we have only to look to the

recent doings of the French Commune. In this country we have plenty of material for both of these extremes. One is law without conscience, the other conscience without law. One rests solely in authority, the other in human reason. One makes the Church every thing, the other makes it nothing. One is religious despotism, the other religious anarchy.

Now, our safety lies in a proper adjustment of these extremes; for it must be apparent to every reflecting mind, that if either of these should ever become dominant in our American life, the whole current of our civilization would be turned backward.

But how shall a proper adjustment be effected? This is the problem for statesmen and religionists to seriously consider.

Looking at the subject from a purely Christian stand-point, the answer would be, make every man a Christian, and thus have a purely Christian civilization. This would, undoubtedly, settle the difficulty; but this is wholly impracticable, and can not, therefore, be offered as a proper solution of the problem before us. We are well aware that there are those who believe that we already have a Christian civilization. But this is evidently more in theory than in fact; more of the thing on paper than in actual life. Horace Mann has truly said that "great books are written for Christianity much oftener than great deeds are done for it. City libraries tell us of the reign of Jesus Christ, but city streets tell us of the reign of Satan." We may affect to exalt the Christian religion as a national safe-guard; but we might prove our sincerity in this if we would first obey its injunctions in private life. Still, it can not be doubted that Christianity has considerable influence in shaping our national characteristics and in giving harmony to the development of our civilization. But we must not lose sight of the fact that the adjustment we propose must deal with two classes of our citizens, neither of which is Christian according to our conception, and neither of which is to be disturbed in the full enjoyment of his civil and religious rights. This is what makes the problem difficult, and yet this is just the form in which it must be considered.

Two solutions have been proposed to this problem. One is to practically unite Church and State; that is, force religion by civil enactment into our common schools, into our constitution, in fact into every thing belonging to our social and political life. The other is to

compel its absence from all these—to leave our American society as destitute of religion as the desert is of vegetation.

But it does not require much reflection to see that these views do not solve the question at all. In fact, they are the same extremes working out their results in our civilization. Hence, neither of these can be accepted, or ought to be accepted, by the American people. We propose, then, the following as our view of the matter:

(1.) Select such general facts in religion as seem essential to the maintenance of good society, and let these be rigidly enforced by civil enactment, and let every thing else in religion be left to the choice of the individual. This will give us the sanctions of religion in the administration of oaths of office, and one day in every week as a day of rest, while no one's civil or religious liberties will in any way be seriously impaired.

(2.) In the matter of public education there should be no enforcement of any religious acts except so far as already enumerated.

(3.) Make the family and the Church responsible for religious development. Make these what they ought to be, and our religious development will be in harmony with the best interests of society. We have already indicated what these should be, and whenever the reformation comes here that is needed, more than half of our dangers will be past.

Now, should it be said that, in this adjustment, some one's liberties are interfered with, we answer, that this must necessarily be so where there are so many interests to conserve. In social compacts, every one must surrender something for the good of all. Government can do no better than to administer human affairs on a basis of compromise; and the wisest government is that which provides for the good of all, without oppressing any one. This is what we believe would result from the adjustment we propose. The extremes to which we have referred would be allowed to remain as they are, except at points vital to our national life; and, surely, no one ought to complain of that which is essential to their own preservation.

II.—"JUDAIC BAPTISM."

II.

DR. DALE begins his reference to authorities by quoting a passage from Josephus (Jewish War, ii, 18), under the head of

"INTUSPOSITION WITHOUT INFLUENCE."

Simon, a distinguished Jew, who had slain his parents, wife, and children, to prevent them from falling into the hands of the enemy, "stretching out his right-hand, so as to escape notice by none, he *mersed* [baptized] the entire sword into his throat." This certainly was a mersion, or an immersion, not of a person, but of a sword. It was also "Judaic"—it was done by a Jew. I wish to call the attention of the English reader to the fact that the doctor uses "intusposition" in his heading, and mersion in his translation of the instance given, as meaning the same thing; and that Webster defines mersion by immersion. This is, then, a clear case of immersion, and is adverse to pouring or sprinkling. It is a case of influence, also, if an unconscious thing can be said to be influenced. It must have been warmed and stained by blood.

The doctor denies that the word baptize here expresses "a definite modal act." Suppose the question were asked, How did Simon commit suicide? The question, How? relates to mode, or manner. The answer is, By immersing the entire sword into his neck. If any word can express mode, *baptidzo* does it. It is also definite, because it excludes wash, purify, wet, pour, and sprinkle, and every other act except immersion. The act is limited, and therefore definite. No language can be more definite than is the Greek, in the words expressive of the use of water. *Brêcho*, to moisten, or wet; *hraino* and *hrantidzo*, to sprinkle; *pluno* and *npto*, to wash; *louo*, to bathe; *katharidzo*, to purify; and *baptidzo*, to immerse. All these words are, in all their usages, words of influence, if any verbs are.

"INTUSPOSITION WITH INFLUENCE."

Under this head he gives five passages from the same author. He admits that all these cases are cases of mersion, or immersion. They are, therefore, definite, as they exclude pour, sprinkle, purify, and all other acts except immersion. Why the immersion of a sword into a man's throat should be said to be without influence, and that of a vessel in the Adriatic, with influence, is hard to tell.

But he contends that *baptidzo* is here indefinite also? Here is a vessel immersed by the weight of six hundred men, and the doctor says that the word which expresses this mersion is indefinite! Was the vessel purified, poured, or sprinkled? No. The doctor says that it was a case of intusposition, which he makes equal to mersion, that is, immersion. Suppose it had been stated that the vessel had been sprinkled, there having been a shower. Would that have been definite? According to brother Dale it would not, because there are divers ways of sprinkling, as from a watering-can, the fingers, a bunch of hyssop; and it can be done in still more ways!

The next instance is the case of the vessel on which Jonah was fleeing to Tarsus, which was *on the point of being baptized*, or immersed. This, the doctor says, is a case of "intusposition with influence." How the immersion of an entire sword in a man's throat, can be a case of intusposition *without influence*, and a case of *threatened*, not accomplished, intusposition of a vessel, can be a case of intusposition with influence, is hard to perceive. The immersion or baptism of the vessel did not take place; but it was *on the point of being immersed*, when Jonah was thrown overboard. So much concerning the doctor's "influence," of which he says so much, and which has no more to do with the meaning of *baptidzo* than it has with the meaning of any other verb.

This he also calls an indefinite use of *baptidzo*. He says that the storm "did threaten to baptize, to swallow up, to engulf, to merse, to place in a condition within the swelling waves without recovery!" Does *baptidzo* here mean all these things? If it means all these things, it is the opposite extreme of sprinkle. How a candid man can say that *baptidzo* means all these things, and, at the same time, barely sprinkle a person, and say, "I baptize thee, in the name of the Father,

Son, and Holy Ghost," is more than any "Baptist," or any Disciple, can explain. This tries "open communion" severely.

THE VESSELS OF THE JEWS IMMERSED OFF JOPPA.

The Romans having captured Joppa, the Jews, in their vessels, put out from the shore. A storm arose and was very destructive to their shipping, and Josephus says, "The lofty billows, rising above their vessels, [baptized] immersed them." If one vessel is immersed by the weight of billows, and another by the weight of six hundred men, does that render the word *baptidzo* indefinite? If so, then one vessel being sprinkled by a shower of rain, another by the fingers, another by a wet broom, and another by a sprinkling-can, renders sprinkling indefinite also, and it can express no "modal act." It has no "specific" meaning! According to this course of criticism, no verb can be definite. But there is no way of disproving immersion except by rendering all verbs indefinite. The cause which requires such havoc of language is a desperate cause. But how does this baptism by "lofty billows, rising above the vessels," agree with sprinkling as a mode of baptism? Will our friends answer to their conscience and their God?

The next case from Josephus relates that, in a naval engagement between the Jews and Romans on the Lake Genesareth, the light vessels of the Jews were crushed by the heavier vessels of the Romans, and the Jews were baptized, or immersed, with their vessels. This is also admitted by the doctor as a case of intusposition, mersion, or immersion. Where is sprinkling, then? It is excluded. By what law? Of Popery? Nay; but by the law of language. Well did brother Dale say, "To make *baptidzo* mean to sprinkle is an error." See "Classic Baptism."

The fifth reference is to the same author, and in relation to the same battle and the same men. Josephus says of those *baptized*, which rose to the surface, "Either a dart overtook, or a vessel seized upon them." Of these men brother Dale says, "By their efforts to escape the natural and ordinary consequence of baptism in water of human beings, they succeeded in rising to the surface." This is a death-blow to sprinkling. In sprinkling there is no rising to the surface, because there is no immersion in it. After all the play and pious

fun of the doctor, relative to "dipping," every case of the baptism of persons by the apostles was "a dipping," or a brief immersion; for they "buried" their converts in baptism, (ὥ) *in which* they were also raised with Christ. (Ep. Col. ii, 12.)

The wonderful ado of Dr. Dale about leaving the baptized object in the water is beneath the dignity of a linguist. With the apostles the resurrection was as much a part of baptism as was the burial.

He says that "a human being baptized into water, and left to the natural force of such baptism, state, or condition, will as certainly and invariably perish, as that a man was created to live upon the earth and to breathe the atmosphere." If this is so, why was Jesus not destroyed? He was (ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην) *baptized by John into the Jordan*. (Mark i, 9.) Moreover, John declared that he baptized his disciples (ἐν ὕδατι) *in water*; and Mark says they were all baptized (ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ) *in the Jordan River, by him*. (Mark i, 5.) These persons were baptized in water, and were not drowned, but were *raised* in baptism. If, then, baptizing a person into water, and taking him out without harm, is "dipping," then John and the apostles did "dip" their converts; and the doctor's oft-repeated assertion, that *baptidzo* never means to dip, is disproved by many myriads of instances. Plutarch, in his *Life of Alexander*, says that "the soldiers along the whole way on their return from his Eastern conquests, were (βαπτίζοντες) *dipping with* cups and horns and goblets, from great wine-jars and mixing-bowls," and "were drinking to one another." Hippocrates, speaking of the respiration of a patient with cynanche, a swelling of the throat and oppression around the heart, says, "She breathed as persons breathe after *having been* (ἔβαπτίσθαι) *baptized*." This, as there is a return from the water before perishing, amounts to what Dr. Dale calls "a dipping," and yet he denies that *baptidzo* ever has this sense. Describing the same case, this author, in Book VII, says, "And she breathed, as if breathing after having been baptized." Here was a return from the water, and according to the doctor's own rule, it must be "a dipping." "Achilleis" Statius, describing the manner in which the Egyptian sailor drinks water from the Nile, says, "He lets down his hand into the water (εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ), and *baptizing* it, hollowed, and filling it with water, he darts the draught toward his mouth, and hits the mark." This, according to brother Dale's own principle of interpretation, is also a

clear case of "dipping," or brief immersion. Strabo, speaking of the Lake Tatta, says, "The water solidifies so readily around every thing which is *baptized into* it, that they draw up salt-crowns when they let down a circle of rushes." Here is a case of return from, or rather out of, the water, and *baptidzo* is in regimen with *eis*, into. This, then, is a case of brief immersion, or dipping, if the doctor's principle is good; and yet he denies that *baptidzo* ever means to dip. Plutarch, on Superstition, says that a superstitious man was told to "call the old Expiatrix, and *baptize* himself (*εἰς θαλάσσαν*) *into the sea*, and spend a day sitting on the ground." Here is a case of return out of the sea before perishing, and is, according to brother Dale's own position, a case of dipping. The regimen is, also, baptize, or dip into. It is said, in what seems to be falsely ascribed to Plutarch, of a Roman General, who fell mortally wounded, that he took away the shields of the slain enemies, (*καὶ εἰς τὸ αἷμα τῶν χεῖρα βαπτίσας*) and *baptizing*—or dipping—his hand into the blood, he set up a trophy, inscribing it, "The Romans against the Samnites, to trophy-bearing Jove." This is a clear case of brief immersion, or dipping, contrary to the doctor's declaration that *baptidzo* is never used in the sense of dip. Josephus, describing the manner of purifying the people during the thirty days of mourning for Miriam, says that those who were defiled by the dead body, threw a little ashes into a fountain, and, "*baptizing* (*βαπτίζαντες*) a hyssop-branch, (*ἕρπον*) *sprinkled* on the third and seventh of the days." Here the two acts of *baptizing* and *sprinkling* are both mentioned and clearly distinguished, and both used with special reference to purification. *Baptidzo* here clearly means, to dip—the very thing which the doctor has so often denied, and with so much confidence too. The hyssop-branch was dipped, or baptized, in the ash-water, and then used to, *not baptize*, but to *sprinkle*, those who were defiled by the dead body. It should be remembered, too, that this was a *Judaic baptism*, and for a religious purpose.

This passage proves, beyond reasonable doubt, that Judaic baptism is "dipping," the very thing the doctor denies. (Ant. Jews, Book IV, ch. iv, 6.)

An ancient medical writing "On the Diseases of Women," Book I, contains the following direction relative to the use of the pessary: "Then dipping into oil of roses or Egyptian oil, apply it during the day; and when it begins to sting, remove it, and again, dip (*baptize*)

again into breast-milk and Egyptian ointment." In the beginning of this passage, *bapto* is used for dip, and when *the same act is required to be repeated* (βαπτίζειν πάλιν) *baptize* it AGAIN, is used instead of repeating *bapto*; showing that both words expressed the very same act contrary to the oft-repeated assertion of the doctor.

In the Homeric Allegories, ch. ix, having proved that *baptidzo* means to dip, I propose to show that the dative without the preposition does not change the meaning of the verb: "Since the mass of iron, drawn red-hot from the furnace, (ἔδατι βαπτίζεται) *is dipped in water* [not dipped *with* water], and the fiery glow, by its own nature quenched with water, ceases." There is no use in saying that red-hot iron can be cooled by *pouring* water on it, nor by *sprinkling* water on it. If pouring had been intended, *cheo*, and not *baptidzo*, was the proper word; and if sprinkling had been meant, *hrantidzo*, and not *baptidzo*, would have been used.

So, also, Julian, "Ode on Cupid:—" "As I was once twining a garland, I found Cupid in the roses; and holding by the wings, *I dipped him into the wine* (εβαπτισ' εἰς τὸν οἶνον), and took and drank him." This is another instance of *baptidzo* with *eis*, into, which Dr. Dale represented as unusual.

Thus Simplicius, "Comment. on the Manual of Epictetus,"—of bodily or corporeal beauty he says: "Beautifying them, indeed, as much as possible, but also itself partaking of their deformity, (καὶ βεβαπτισμένον εἰς αὐτήν) *and dipped into it.*" *Baptidzo* with *eis* again.

"A certain man having a grudge against a fox for some mischief done by her, after getting her into his power, contrived a long time how to punish her; and dipped tow in oil, he bound it to her tail, and set fire to it." (Æsopic Fables: Fable of the Man and the Fox.)

"Philip did not give over dipping, in a match with the pancratists, (κατὰ τοῦ προσώπου βανθόμενος) and sprinkling along the face." (Polyænus, Stratagems, Book IV, ch. ii, 6.) Here, again, dipping, or baptism, and sprinkling are distinguished, and are expressive of different acts.

Having now redeemed our pledge, by showing, "by many infallible proofs," that *baptidzo* does put its object into water, and speedily withdraws it, we have proved that brother Dale is entirely in error on this whole subject.

"INTUSPOSITION FOR INFLUENCE."

The doctor gives us three cases, from Josephus, of what he calls "intusposition for influence." When Simon immersed the entire sword into his throat, the doctor says it was "without influence;" when a vessel was immersed in the sea, he says it was "with influence;" and when a man was immersed repeatedly, till he was strangled, he says it was "for influence." He admits that all these cases were cases of intusposition, or, as he translates, of "mersion," which means the same as immersion. They all prove the doctrine of immersion—not pouring, not sprinkling, not even purifying. Intusposition, mersion, or immersion, in all cases, whatever may be the design, medium, or effect, is the same. So of sprinkling; so of pouring. It makes no difference, as to the meaning of the word, whether oil, ashes, water, or blood is sprinkled or poured upon any thing or person, sprinkle still means, to scatter in drops or particles. Nor does the effect produced change the meaning of the verb. This is true of all verbs. To strike—whether one hits a man or a lion, a woman or a dove, whether in sport or in malice, whether he wounds or kills—still means, to strike. Suppose I say, to strike without influence, to strike with influence, and to strike for influence,—does not the word *strike* mean the same thing in each case? So intusposition, whether without influence, with influence, or for influence, is intusposition, or immersion, and nothing more nor less.

The first example under this head is that of Aristobulus, a distinguished high-priest, and of royal blood, among the Jews, whom Herod caused to be strangled by baptizing, or immersing, his head while he was swimming. The doctor is still in great terror of "dip," and therefore he tries to make it appear that this is not a case of dipping. If a man's head is repeatedly and rapidly put under the water and taken out, is not this a dipping according to the brother's oft-repeated assertion?

The author says, "Always pressing down and (baptizing) mersing him, as if in sport, while swimming, they ceased not until they had wholly drowned him." Concerning this, Dr. Dale says: "Two things are evident in the narrative: 1. Aristobulus was not pressed down sufficiently long, the first time, to suffocate him. This would have betrayed the murderous intent. He was pressed down sufficiently

deep, and kept under water sufficiently long, to cause partial exhaustion. A repetition of such 'sport' soon produced the legitimate effect of a pressing-down baptism." The doctor says, "The repetition of such 'sport.'" The "sport" was not repeated. The repetition was in the baptism, or dipping. This "downward movement into a diverse element, with a speedy return," is just what brother Dale defines "dip." Why does he deny at one time what he affirms at another? The "theory" demands it. We notice that baptism is here said to be effected by pressing down. Is this the way to sprinkle people? Was any person ever drowned by sprinkling? If a person can be drowned by baptism, and can not be drowned by sprinkling, then sprinkling can not be baptism. If a person must be pressed down into the water to be baptized, then pouring and sprinkling can not be baptism, for neither of them requires any pressing down. On page 68, the doctor says, "Drowned by baptism in a pool." Why did he not say, Drowned by *sprinkling* in a pool?

The second example under this head is from the same author, and relates to the same case. It reads, "And there, *being baptized* (*βαπτιζόμενος*) in a pool by the Galatians, according to command, he died." On this passage Dr. Dale himself says that Aristobulus was "drowned by baptism" (page 68). The drowning, as he admits, was the effect of baptism. When did sprinkling produce such an effect? When did purification produce such an effect? To be purified to death, and to be sprinkled to death, would be cruel deaths to die. I would prefer the repeated immersions, or dippings, of Aristobulus. The doctor says that this man "was 'pressed down' sufficiently deep, and kept under water sufficiently long, to cause partial exhaustion. A repetition of such sport on one who each time was less able to recover himself, soon produced the legitimate effect of a 'pressing-down' baptism. He was drowned." The doctor, notwithstanding he affirms that, keeping him "under water sufficiently long," "he was drowned," goes on and ridicules Dr. Carson for affirming the same fact in these words: "It was not the word *baptidzo* which destroyed him: it was the keeping him too long under the water after immersion." How can what is sensible in Dr. Dale be ridiculous in Dr. Carson? Both agree that if the man had not been kept under the water sufficiently long, he would not have been drowned. Why, then, should Dr. Dale ridicule Dr. Carson by saying: "'Died from being buried by

the fall of a sand-bank,' says the coroner's jury. 'Wrong,' says the critic; 'being buried did not kill him: it was the remaining too long under the sand.'" This ridicule is just as applicable to Dr. Dale as to Dr. Carson, as both agree in the fact that he was drowned by being kept too long under water. This ridicule has not even the merit of being witty. Did any man ever drown who was *not* "kept under water sufficiently long" to produce that effect? The *act* of putting a man under the water never drowned any man; but too long continuance in that condition always produces that effect. Many persons have been put under water who were not drowned. Is not baptizing, or putting under water, one thing, and keeping "under water sufficiently long" to produce death, another? Or does *put under* and *keep under* mean the same thing? If this is so, then *put* and *keep* mean the same thing—as *under* in both words is the same. The doctor's own words show that he knows that baptizing, or putting under, and keeping under, are two distinct things. He says: "He was pressed down sufficiently deep"—this is one thing—"and kept under water sufficiently long"—this is quite another thing. Which caused the drowning? The passage is conclusive as proof that *baptidzo* means to dip, as the act was repeated before the drowning happened. It is also conclusive against sprinkling; for a man may be sprinkled, world without end, and not be drowned. This man was not sprinkled to death, but dipped to death, contrary to the oft-repeated declaration of the doctor. A rapid "repetition of such" dipping "soon produced the legitimate effect" of brief and rapidly succeeding immersions, leaving insufficient time to breathe. This case of a "Judaic baptism" is clearly in favor of the Baptists.

The next passage is from the same author. (Jewish War, iii, 8.) Arguing against suicide to avoid peril, Josephus represents that act as unmanly and as cowardly—as the doctor says, "As the action of a pilot who should sink his ship for fear of a storm" (page 70). The historian says, "As, also, I esteem a pilot most cowardly, who, fearing a storm, should voluntarily *baptize* his ship before the tempest came." The doctor owns that this baptism was a sinking; and certainly this is proof of immersion. Could a pilot sink a ship by sprinkling water on her deck? The doctor here repeats his old assertion that no "particular form of act" is here specified by which the ship is supposed to be immersed. Very well. The same would have been true

if he had said the pilot sprinkled his ship. He might have scattered the water by the use of his fingers, a bunch of hyssop, a broom, or a sprinkling-pot. We here repeat the fact, so often repeated already, that there is no *verb* in any language that expresses a "form of act." An act has no form. Brother Dale admits that this ship was baptized, in the case here supposed, by *sinking*. This is conclusive against sprinkling and every thing but immersion. The doctor himself translates the Greek verb, *merse*, which is equivalent to *to immerse*. He dares not translate it, *according to his own practice*, to sprinkle. He knows, and has said, that "to make *baptidzo* mean to sprinkle, is an error." If *baptize* does not mean to sprinkle, then sprinkle does not mean baptize.

"FIGURE GROUNDED IN DESTRUCTIVE MERSION."

Under this head, the doctor gives two examples from Josephus (Jewish War, ii, 20 ; i, 27.)

1. "Many of the distinguished Jews, as from a ship being mersed, swam away from the city."

On this passage Dr. Dale justly remarks : "The comparison thus made between the condition of the city being ruined and the condition of a ship being swallowed up, leads to the use of a word ('to swim away') expressive of a method of escape well adapted to one member of the comparison, a ship, but not appropriate, in its form of movement, to the other, a city." I say he has justly said this, if Josephus did not regard the city, in its downfall, as "a ship being immersed." It would be utterly absurd to speak of the Jews as *swimming away from Jerusalem*, if the figure in the mind of the writer did not present the city under the figure of a vessel being submerged. The doctor asks : "Are we, then, to understand the writer, by the use of this term (swimming), and by the comparison with a ship, to intend that his readers should conceive of Jerusalem as encompassed by a waste of waters, into which its citizens are leaping and 'swimming away?'" We reply : No ; they were not to conceive of Jerusalem as a city, but as a ship being submerged, and the distinguished Jews as men leaving this ship to save their lives. Any other view makes the expression ridiculous. In reading this account of Jerusalem we must lose sight of it as a city, and view it according to the figure introduced by the writer, as a ship which is being submerged.

Any other view of this "swimming away" is absurd, if not ridiculous also. No wonder that brother Dale sees the absurdity of conceiving of the citizens of Jerusalem as "swimming away" from the city, as such. But when their flight is contemplated as the flight of men from a vessel being submerged, and the city is viewed in that light, the fugitives may well be said to swim away from it. When these people are said to "fly" from the city, it no longer retains, in the narrative, the figure of a ship being submerged, but is again conceived of *as a city*, and the hurried retreat of the citizens being called "flying away," suggests the idea of frightened birds. When it is said that they "ran away," I suppose that a literal fact is stated in a literal use of words.

The doctor asks whether, when it is said that they flew away, after it was said that they swam away, we are to "substitute" *wings* for *fins*. I knew that the doctor was, by "the theory," confused in the view he took of the passage; but I did not think, with all his errors in reasoning on philological matters, that, because these distinguished persons are said to have *swum*, they were therefore converted into *fish*, with *fins*. I have seen men swim without *fins*; and I think that even the "PASTOR OF THE MEDIA PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, DELAWARE COUNTY, PENN.," might, by a vigorous effort, swim some, even without *fins*, or without becoming so *fishy* in the effort to swim as he has in this argument. Brother Dale is not as dignified in "Judaic Baptism" as in "Classic Baptism." Is it because the Jews are less dignified than the classic authors? Or is it because of the "controlling influence" of some of his friends who have spoken favorably of some of his witticisms? But this putting *fins* on "distinguished Jews" has not the merit of being witty, nor even mirthful.

The doctor, after noticing the fact that many of the distinguished Jews are said to have swum away, that they are also said to have flown away and ran away, asks: "Is the wealth of imagination to be displayed by the conception of a picture in which all these features are artistically grouped, having war-shattered Jerusalem for its center, encompassing waters for its field, citizens 'running' through its shallows, citizens 'swimming' through its depths, citizens 'flying' through the air,—is this the picture?" This is not even ingenious. It is simply ridicule. He knows that an author may speak of a city as a submerging ship, and then of the citizens as swimming from it. He knows,

also, that the same author may speak afterward of the hasty retreat of the people from that city as a flight from the city, and then, again, of that flight as a running. An author may certainly drop one figure and take up another, to express the same thing in a different point of view; and he may drop that figure also, and speak literally of the same thing, without subjecting himself to ridicule by a sensible and candid critic. Suppose Dr. Dale would try his powers of ridicule on all the parables of Jesus relative to the kingdom of heaven, by grouping them all into one picture; and suppose he would then add all his literal statements relative to the same thing,—would he not render him much more ridiculous than he has rendered Josephus? I am sorry the doctor has thought that the cause of sprinkling, for which he seeks to lay a foundation in logic, requires such means for its support.

The doctor's second example, under this head, reads thus: "This, as a final storm, (*ἐπιβυπτισε*) *overwhelmed* the tempest-tossed youths."

The Greek word here used is a compound of *baptidzo* and (*ἐπι*) *epi*, upon, or over. These sons of Herod are said to be "tempest-tossed," and that by which they were brought to the end of the voyage of life is regarded by the writer as "a final blast;" and, in accordance with this view of the case, he combines this preposition with the idea of an immersion, and thus modifies the meaning of the verb to correspond with this view, so as to make it, by the influence of the preposition, mean an immersion by means of a wave, that is, an overwhelming. Dr. Dale's "overmersed" is invented for the occasion, and for the sake of "the theory." On this passage the doctor says:

"This passage presents, what is rare, a distinct and well-sustained picture figure, with mersion as a leading element. Aristobulus and Alexander, sons of Herod by Mariamne, became, after their mother's death, objects of suspicion, accusations, and plottings, with a view to compass their destruction. Josephus indicates this condition of things, when he speaks of them as tempest-tossed and weather-beaten. They suffered from these influences, but lived. Salome effected their destruction. These facts suggested a resemblance to a ship which has weathered many storms, but, at last, goes down under one of resistless power." (Page 74.)

This is conclusive in favor of immersion, and as conclusive against purify, pour, and sprinkle,

On page 75, he says: "What demands attention here, as bearing on our inquiry, is: 1. The absence of all show of comparison.

between any *act* on the one hand and on the other; 2. The same lack of comparison between any *condition* on the one side, and condition of *envelopment* on the other. This is very strange. Is not the overwhelming effected by a storm or hurricane? Is there no comparison between the acting of this last, or final, storm or blast, and the acts of those who conspired to destroy these persons? Is there no comparison of condition between those *overwhelmed* by a storm at sea, and the condition of these men? Is there no envelopment, or "condition of envelopment," suggested by an overwhelming occasioned by a storm at sea? Why is this figure of overwhelming introduced, if it has no reference to either *act* or *condition* of envelopment? But the doctor says: "It may be asked, Is there no 'envelopment' in baptism? I answer, Yes, in every primary baptism; but that does not carry 'envelopment' into a comparison." The doctor has made envelopment essential and vital to the meaning of baptism primary. He has made baptism *consist* in envelopment, as I have shown in my review of his "Classic Baptism." He says (page 35, Classic Baptism) that "*baptidzo*, in primary use, expresses condition, characterized by complete intusposition." On page 21, same work, he says it "intusposes its object within a fluid element." On page 126, same work, he says, *without restricting his language to primary use*, that the import of this verb is "vitally dependent upon, and governed by, the idea of intusposition within a closely investing element." By "vitally" I understand him to mean essentially. He can mean nothing else by that word in this connection. "Intusposition within a closely investing medium" being the *essential* meaning of the word baptize, if it does not "carry 'envelopment' into comparison," leaves its essence behind it. What is the essence of a word but its meaning? A word which does not carry its meaning with it "into comparison," had better be kept out of comparison, and some word that carries its meaning with it be used in its stead. If it does not carry its own meaning with it, it is a word without knowledge.

He says (page 75, Judaic Baptism), "Envelopment may be the *end* of baptism." He has already made it, not the *end*, but the *essence* of baptism. In the language of Dr. Green, we will allow no "shuffling." On page 127, "Classic Bapism," he says: "An object baptized is completely invested by the baptizing element, whatever

it may be." The whole force of this passage from Josephus is concentrated in the word "overwhelmed," or baptized. Suppose he had said, This, as the last rain, *sprinkled* the tempest-beaten young men,—no one would have supposed that any thing important had happened to them. Rob *baptidzo* of its primary meaning, as given by Dr. Dale himself, and this figure becomes folly. These young men are placed before us, by Josephus, as "tempest-beaten" and "overwhelmed," or baptized, by a wave occasioned by a tempest. The "mode of baptism" here is *overwhelming*, not sprinkling water on them, nor destroying them. Their destruction was not their baptism, but it was, as the doctor says, "the *end* of baptism," in the sense of design. The overwhelming was the *cause* of the drowning; and this overwhelming well expresses the great wave of opposition which finally engulfed these unfortunate sons of Herod. In the figure of Josephus, the "*quo modo*," or question of mode, of their destruction, was *overwhelming*. Their life is regarded as a stormy voyage, and their death as drowning by overwhelming.

The doctor says that "the comparison is between the direct means; namely, Salome's accusation and the final storm." The storm (or Salome's accusation) raised the wave by which they were overwhelmed, as "Achilleis" Statius, in his story of "Leucippe and Clitophon," says, as by "a multitude of evils." His words are: "What so great wrong have we done, as in a few days to be *baptized* with such a multitude of evils?" The "multitude of evils" constituted the wave raised by the "last storm," and by which the sons of Herod were overwhelmed, and, as a consequence, drowned, or destroyed. The overwhelming was not the destruction, but it was the *cause* of the destruction; and the envelopment is kept in view to represent the "multitude of evils" which, as a great wave, overwhelmed "the tempest-beaten young men." The doctor misstates the meaning of *baptidzo* when he says it "speaks directly of the destruction." It speaks directly of the *cause* of destruction, but not of the destruction. There can be no "shuffling" here. Dr. Green says that Dr. Dale does not allow it by the Baptists, and we can not allow it by him.

"LITERAL, SECONDARY USE."

Under this head, brother Dale gives us three passages, two from Josephus, and one from "Philo, Eusebius." His object is to show that

baptidzo means "influence pervading and controlling, unlimited in form, force, or time." Again, we remind him of the fact that *baptidzo* is an active verb, and, as such, it expresses *action*. "Influence" is a noun, and noun is from the Latin *nomen*, name. It is, then, "the name of any creature or thing, existing in fact or in thought." Is *baptidzo* the name of a creature? If so, of what creature? Is it the name of a thing? If so, of what thing? According to the doctor's reasoning, this verb is the name of a "condition." Of what condition? His answer must be of a "condition without intusposition!" It must be, also, the name of an "influence." Of what influence? He must reply, an "influence pervading and controlling." And this influence, of which *baptidzo*, an active verb, is the name, must be "unlimited in form, force, or time." If *baptidzo* is not a condition of intusposition, or a condition within, it must be, if a condition at all, a condition without, that is, an external condition. The first example he gives is that which speaks of the "multitude of evils," which it was supposed would come upon and overwhelm (ἐπιβαπτισεῖν) the city of Jotapata, in case Josephus should leave it. This *verb*, then, is the name of the external condition of Jotapata, as contemplated if Josephus fled and did not defend it. No reference is made to its *intus* condition, or condition within, because *baptidzo* means a "condition without intusposition." This same *active verb* does not express *act*, but "influence pervading and controlling;" and, as it relates to matters wholly external, it must mean external influence! If, then, it means external influence which *pervades*, which is in all parts of the exterior of the city of Jotapata, it must *envelop* it. This comes up to the doctor's oft-repeated definition of *baptidzo*, and the Baptist view of its meaning. *Baptidzo* is a verb, not a noun—not influence. But he says that this influence is not only pervading, but that it is controlling also—"unlimited in form, force, or time." It must, therefore, be an *overwhelming* influence. Now, this points directly to the meaning of *epibaptisein*, to overwhelm. If the doctor would throw away his "controlling influence," and would substitute overwhelming influence; and say that *baptidzo* means, in some instances, not overwhelming influence, but to influence overwhelmingly—that is, to envelope in influence—he would come much nearer the sense of *baptidzo*. An influence which is unlimited in form, force, and time, must not only be a controlling, but an *overwhelming* influence. So,

when it was said that if Josephus left the city, it was affirmed, not that he would influence the city controllingly, but that he would *overwhelm* it "in so great a multitude of evils" as would befall it, in consequence of his deserting it.

So, also, of his second example from Josephus, who, speaking of the robber-chiefs who came into the city of Jerusalem in the time of the siege, says, "Who, even apart from the sedition, afterward *baptized*, or immersed, the city;" not sprinkled, poured, nor purified it, but immersed it in trouble and distress, by consuming its supplies, and thus bringing on a famine. The city was immersed in all the evils attendant on famine.

The third example, under this head, is thus translated by brother Dale: "One might evidence it also, by this: The sober and content are more intelligent, but those always filled with drink and food are least intelligent, as though the reason were mersed by the things coming upon it."

Brother Dale, after indulging in ridicule of Drs. Carson and Conant, says: "The reason is affected beneficially by temperance, while it is baptized—influenced injuriously—by gluttony." Here he makes baptize mean, to influence injuriously! He ought not to complain of the Baptists for dodging from one definition to another. He does more business in this line, and with much less capital, than all the Baptist authors he quotes. If an immersion, in some cases, results injuriously, then he would define *baptidzo*, to influence injuriously! If it should result beneficially, then it must be rendered, to influence beneficially! And if it should be "without influence," then it must be translated, to influence without influence! Let not the reader think that we are treating the doctor unfairly, for he positively says (Classic Baptism, page 13) that *bapto* "dips without dipping," and (page 14) that the Latin *tingo* "dips without dipping!"

According to the doctor's reasoning, if a limb is amputated and the result is injurious, then to amputate means, to influence injuriously! But if the operation is beneficial, then to amputate means, to influence beneficially! If eating too much injures a man, then it baptizes him; and, by parity of reasoning, if a man baptizes himself, and it injures him, he eats too much; for if to eat too much means to baptize, then, in the same connection, to baptize must mean to eat too much. "Such interpretation must stand

until the negative of these questions is established," says the doctor.

The meaning of the passage is, that if one is "always filled with drink and food," the effect is "as though the reason were (*βαπτίζομενός*) *immersed* by the things coming upon it." We notice here, that the baptism is not predicated of the *man*, but of the *reason*. Further, the reason is not here said to be immersed, or baptized, but that the least intelligent are *as though* their reason were immersed. It is not said in what Dr. Dale mistakes when he thinks that those who insist on a figurative use of *baptidzo* are obliged to imagine a stream, a pool, or a flood of water. The purposes of ridicule may be subserved by such a representation, but the argument does not necessarily require the introduction of water into the figure. The immersion of a sword into a man's body, or the immersion of any thing into mud or slime or any other easily penetrable substance, is as literal as the immersion into water, and furnishes as good an example for a figurative use as does water itself. When we speak of the mersion, or immersion, of *the reason of the least intelligent*, the question may arise, Into what is this reason immersed? The reply is easy—into ignorance. The case is not a difficult one. But if the statement had been that the "least intelligent" had their reason sprinkled, or were as if the reason had been purified by sprinkling, it would require some study to determine what the writer could have intended; and the conclusion might be easily reached, that he was "filled with drink and food" when he wrote it, and that he imagined himself in a class-meeting, telling his own experience at the time.

"BAPTISM BY WINE-DRINKING."

Under this head, the doctor quotes this passage from Philo: "I know some, who, when they become slightly intoxicated, before they (*βαπτισθήναι*) are completely *immersed* [or as he himself translates it, in 'Classic Baptism,' 'mersed'], make, provide a carousal for the morrow by contribution and tickets." In "Judaic Baptism," he translates the same word by become "thoroughly drunk." Unless the doctor abandons his uniform translation of *baptidzo* throughout "Classic Baptism," we must understand that "thoroughly drunk," in "Judaic Baptism," is equivalent to "*mersed*" in "Classic Baptism." Merse, as we have shown, means immerse or overwhelm, the latter word being

more applicable, in the English language, when the element in which the baptism takes place is represented as active, it being, at the same time, both agent and medium. In this passage there is no necessity to depart from the use of immerse, as there is no agency expressed or implied in the use of the verb. The verb is here used passively, as is also (*αποθώραξας*) *slightly intoxicated*. Both verbs, when so used, are expressive of "condition." "Slightly intoxicated" expresses the condition of those whose *intellect only* is disturbed, but whose *bodies are able to obey their impulses*. But the "immersed" are those who are, both soul and body, "intusposed," or "enveloped," in drunkenness. So says Plutarch: "For of the slightly intoxicated, only the intellect is disturbed; but the body is able to obey its impulses, being not yet immersed," baptized. (Banquet, Book III, question 8.) The Greeks never regarded a man as baptized, or immersed, by wine, while his body could obey its impulses. But if *baptidzo* had meant to sprinkle, the "slightly intoxicated" would have been regarded as baptized. By calling this complete envelopment of soul and body in intoxication a baptism, they show a direct reference to the primary meaning of *baptidzo*, to baptize. In no case did *baptidzo*, when used in relation to drunkenness, ever lose its primary meaning. The doctor says, "Such use of *baptidzo* is to be regarded as proof that this word had secured to itself the power to express, directly, the influence of wine-drinking—to make drunk." *Baptidzo* expresses, directly, the influence of wine-drinking! Influence is a noun; and how can a verb express "directly," or in any other way, a noun? "The influence of wine-drinking" is a noun-phrase, which the doctor defines by the *verb* "to make drunk!" He can define a verb by a noun, and a noun by a verb. (Page 84.)

Brother Dale, on page 85, quotes from "Classic Baptism" several passages, in all of which he abandons his own translation in that work, by substituting, in this, "to make drunk" for "merse!" *Baptidzo* never means, to make drunk. When used actively it means, to immerse in drunkenness, in stupor, and in sleep, or in something else. *The immersion, in each of these cases, is as literal as any immersion in any thing else.* It is an envelopment—an intusposition—a close investiture on all sides. *Baptidzo* is never used of slight intoxication, partial stupor, or sleep. It never means a sprinkling, nor a pouring, nor a purifying with drunkenness, stupor, nor sleep. It does not

express "the influence" of drunkenness, of stupor, nor of sleep. Nor does it ever express the influence of "wine-drinking." A man may drink wine and not become intoxicated. But if he, by the use of wine, becomes enveloped in sleep, stupor, or intoxication, he is immersed.

The doctor says that *baptidzo* "is employed absolutely, without any helping adjunct, and without the shadow of stated or designed figure" (page 85). That, in all the cases of which he there speaks, the word is used without a figure, I have no doubt. It means, in all these cases, "to merse," or immerse. I do not believe that *baptidzo* is often, if ever, used in any other than its literal and primary sense. The *mediums* in which the immersion is performed may be spoken of in a figurative way; and the means of immersion may be various. A man is immersed, whether dipped, plunged, whelmed, mersed, merged, submerged, or sunken. Neither of these words is to be taken as a figurative use of immerse, but as indicating some circumstance attending the immersion, as well as the immersion itself. Dip means a brief immersion; plunge, a violent immersion; whelm, an immersion *with* water as a means, and at the same time *in* it as a medium; merge, an immersion by sinking or swallowing up; submerge, an immersion by putting under water; sink, an immersion with the idea of descending lower and lower. *Baptidzo* covers all these modifications of immersing, as dip and sprinkle cover all the various means by which they are performed. Dip, for instance, in general, means putting in and taking out, without regard to the means by which, or the manner in which, either is done. Sprinkle, means to scatter in drops or particles, without regard to means or mode. The fact that all these acts can be performed in different ways does not prove that these verbs are generic; for generic means, pertaining to a genus; and genus means, a class of objects divided into several subordinate species. It relates to nouns, and not to acts. Generic also relates to nouns—not to verbs. To dip, to sink, to merse, to merge, to submerge, to whelm, to overwhelm, to pour, to sprinkle, and to purify, are not so many species of a genus. They are not species. They belong to no genus. They all express different acts, each of which may be performed in different ways. But an object can not be immersed by any act of sprinkling, nor by any act of pouring. Nor can it be poured by any act of sprinkling or immersing. Pour, sprinkle, and immerse, are not so many ways or modes of baptism. Because

baptidzo means "to intuspose," to "envelop" on all sides. To this brother Dale himself testifies. Pouring and sprinkling, not being modes of *intusposing* or *enveloping*, can not be modes of baptizing. There is not the least reason or authority for calling them, or either of them, baptism. The Greeks never used either sprinkle or pour, as they did baptize, to express the idea of intusposition in drunkenness, stupor, nor sleep. They expressed the idea that a person was literally enveloped, or immersed, in these things. That is precisely what *baptidzo* means.

In relation to *baptidzo*, the doctor says (page 106, Classic Baptism): "It has already been stated that *to merse* is the primary meaning which we assign to this word; and that it does not, of its own force, express any form of act, but the result of some act or acts (involved as necessary to the accomplishment of the effect, but) unexpressed." He gives *merse* as the secondary meaning also. He also says that it belongs to "the same class," and is "of similar general import" to "bury—drown—whelm." Can this be said of sprinkle or of purify? He says, further, that bury "does not announce an act to be done, but a result to be secured." He then quotes Horne Tooke on the etymology of the word, as follows: "Burial is the diminutive from *burgh*, a defended or fortified place." Then brother Dale says, "To bury, then, demands protection for its object, by position within some inclosing material."

It is curious to see how closely the doctor adheres to the primary meaning of some words (bury, for instance), and how far he tries to depart from the primary of *baptidzo*. But his theory demands it, and it must be done. He refers to the burial of Sarah in the cave of the field of Machpelah, the burial of the Savior in a sepulcher, the burial of soldiers in trenches dug on the field of battle, the burial of persons in the ocean, and the burial of the daughter of an Indian chief on a platform, raised some feet on poles. He ought to have known that Horne Tooke's etymology of burial is discarded. Webster says: "BURY, [A-S. *byrgan*, allied to *beorgan*, to keep, cover, hide.] 1. To cover out of sight, as in a grave. 2. To hide in oblivion." Bury does not mean to defend. Suppose some man should purposely bury a live person for the sake of killing him,—would that be defending him? The doctor's criticisms are not to be relied on, whether of Greek, Latin, or English words.

But he says that *baptidzo* is of the same class of words with bury, and of similar general import. If this is so, and if his definition of bury is correct, then *baptidzo* must mean to defend. And as he says that bury demands protection for its object, then *baptidzo* must demand protection for its object! But he adds to the idea of protection that of "position within some inclosing material." Baptism, then, must demand position within some inclosing material. Is this true of sprinkling or purifying? If not, sprinkling and purifying can not be baptism.

If the general import of bury and baptize are the same, then no distinction can be made between these words as to primary and secondary use. Of *bury*, he says (page 107, *Classic Baptism*): "The secondary or metaphorical use of this word is equally devoid of all reference to act." I will ask the reader to notice the fact that the doctor makes the secondary and metaphorical use the same. If this is true, as I think it is, then the secondary use of *baptidzo* must be metaphorical. "Metaphorical means, pertaining to, or comprising, a metaphor, figurative." (Webster.) Why, then, does brother Dale deny that *baptidzo*, secondary, is a figurative use of the word? He has perseveringly ridiculed the Baptists for holding that doctrine. On page 110, he gives "buried *in* a monastery" as the metaphorical use of bury, and, at the same time, contends that it is not a figurative use of the word bury! (Page 111.)

Pope says:

"Thy hand, great Chaos, lets the curtain fall;
And universal darkness *buries* all."

The doctor admits that there is a figure in the first line; but denies any in the second! Has he not already said that the secondary is the metaphorical use, and is not a metaphor a figure? Why affirm and deny the same fact, just as "the theory" demands? But as the doctor says that bury means to defend, the last line must then mean that universal darkness *defends* all, when great Chaos lets the curtain fall!

"I have, as when the sun doth light a storm,
Buried this sigh in a wrinkle of a smile."

Does this mean, defended this sigh in a wrinkle? No. The doctor has abandoned Tooke's etymology and his own definition; and he now says that bury means "to disappear!" When, then, a person

goes out of sight, he buries! He says, "A smile may be said to bury—cause to disappear!"

"Princeton has gone on in the accustomed way; professors *buried* in the immensity of their subjects." Does this mean defended in the immensity of their subjects? If so, then their defenses must be immense! No; bury does not mean to defend now. The doctor has seen his mistake in definition in the first instance, and has, therefore, given us, not an amended, but a new, definition of bury; namely, to make or cause to disappear! Then, those learned professors have disappeared, gone out of sight, in the immensity of their subjects! But he says that "an object which is buried, is placed in a condition which removes it from the surface." He does not say whether it removes it *up* or down from the surface. Then, to bury, now means to remove from the surface! No; our brother is progressive. He changes his definition again. Now it means, "progressing into the depths of their great themes!" Surely, this must be an age of progress, in the art of burial, at Princeton! But our author is still progressing in definition. He further says that bury may be used to express "profound and not superficial study." "Bury," a verb, may be used to express profound and not superficial study! A *verb* may be used "to express" two adjectives, "profound" and "superficial," one noun, "study," one conjunction, "and," and one adverb, "not!" And all this is secondary, or metaphorical, but not figurative!

"*Brutus*—Give me a bowl of wine;
In this I *bury* all unkindness, Cassius."

Here, the doctor says, "the wine-cup, emptied in friendly pledge, put away, buried 'all unkindness!'" All former definitions are now "put away;" that is, according to this new definition, buried! Are the Princeton professors put away?

"But in your bride you *bury* brotherhood."

Of this brother Dale says, "Meaning that the bride is the occasion of the destruction of fraternal affection." Now, "bury" means to destroy fraternal affection! Instead of meaning "to defend," it means to destroy! Is all fraternal affection destroyed among the professors at Princeton? Is the sigh destroyed in a wrinkle? Did universal darkness destroy all when "great Chaos let the curtain fall?" When one "buried himself in a monastery," did he destroy himself?

"He lay *buried* in the deep, lethargic sleep, which was his only refuge from the misery of consciousness." Of this man brother Dale says, "The sleeper is held bound in every sense, physical and intellectual, by profound lethargy." To bury, then, means to hold bound! "The theory" requires all these absurd interpretations of bury, and it must be defended; that is, according to the general definition, it must be buried! For the doctor says that bury means, to defend! But brother Dale says, in this case, that "buried does, most legitimately, mean, in such use, *to be under the power of*; and such burial becomes a protection, a refuge, a *burgh* from a stinging conscience." Protection, refuge, and *burgh* are here used in apposition, as if they all meant the same thing! The grave, or the sepulcher, is not the refuge; but the burial is the refuge, the burgh, if our brother is correct relative to "buried."

Let us try another example, and see how he will bury or "defend" himself:

"Before I freely speak my mind herein,
You shall not only take the sacrament
To bury my intents, but to effect
Whatever I shall happen to devise."

On this passage the doctor says: "Every object 'buried' is placed in a covered condition. Every such covered object is concealed. To bury embraces the idea of concealment." This the doctor says, with reference to "every object buried;" on page 112, "Classic Baptism," after having said, on page 111, "When it is said of a man who lies at our feet, in full view, that 'he is buried in sleep,'" is it not "patently absurd" to say that, in such case, bury means to cover over, to hide from view? Does the speaker mean to "stultify himself or those whom he addresses?" Put these two passages together, and then let the doctor answer his own questions; as he certainly ought to know what he means by such palpable contradictions.

Whether a buried man lies full in view, or is concealed, depends on whether that in which he is buried conceals him or not. If he is buried in darkness, he is concealed. If he is buried in clear water, he is in full view when people stand by him. "To bury embraces the idea of concealment." So says the doctor; but he mistakes. He is not critical in his knowledge of language. He seems utterly incapable of taking a word in all its usages, and from them deducing a

general meaning. The various usages of a word are only modifications of the general meaning. "Bury," never, in all its usages, loses its primary sense, whether a cave, a monastery, a "wrinkle of a smile," or any thing else be the receptacle.

In "Classic Baptism," page 11, the doctor says, "*Bury* demands covered condition for its object." On page 106, he says, "Bury, then, demands protection for its object by position within some inclosing material." At one time it "demands *covered* condition;" at another time, position within; at another time, it "demands protection for its object."

After having affirmed, without any restrictions, that "bury demands covered condition for its object," he asks (page 111, Christian Baptism), where a man is said to have lain "buried in the deep, lethargic sleep," whether it is not "patently absurd to say that, in such case, bury means to cover." If it is so, the doctor's statement of the demand of bury, is a patent absurdity. Brother Dale has not *patented* this absurdity, but he has secured the copyright of it.

On page 108, "Classic Baptism," the doctor says that "an object buried is thereby [that is, by the act of burying] concealed shut out of view, separated from other things." Then, on page 111, he says that the man is "in full view." Then he asks whether the man who affirms just what he affirmed on page 108, means "to stultify himself or those whom he addresses!" The doctor can best answer this question himself. I think he can speak better for himself than others can speak for him.

The next case of *Judaic* baptism to which Dr. Dale calls our attention, is what he calls

"BAPTISM BY DRUNKENNESS."

I see no propriety in calling baptism in sleep, stupor, etc., *Judaic*. I think it is about as *Gentilic* as *Judaic*. The passage he cites is from Josephus, a Jew, but the same thing is found often in Gentile authors. The passage reads "(καὶ βεβαπτισμένον) and baptized by drunkenness into insensibility and sleep." Drunkenness is here "the baptist," or the baptizer. Gedaliah is the "candidate," and "insensibility and sleep" are the medium in which the baptism took place. So, we have the baptism of Gedaliah, *by* drunkenness, *into* insensibility and sleep. The question now to be answered is, Can this be understood literally,

or are we obliged to take some word in a figurative sense?" Gedaliah is the name of a man who was baptized in insensibility and sleep. He is not a fictitious person, but a literal, historical person. "Insensibility and sleep" are both names of the "conditions" *into which* Gedaliah was put by drunkenness. Drunkenness is the name of a state which is called intoxication. All these are literal things. Insensibility and sleep are, like other states, penetrable or enterable. This entrance may be partial or entire. When it is partial, it is never called a baptism. The entrance into these states is as literal as is the entrance into any other thing. Both of these states, when the entrance is entire, *envelop* both body and mind. This envelopment is called a baptism, and is a *literal immersion*, or, as brother Dale is pleased to call it, a "mersion," which Webster defines, immersion. In "Classic Baptism" brother Dale uses "merse" for baptize throughout what he calls the primary and secondary uses of *baptidzo*.

BAPTIDZO, *merse, or immerse, is not more PRIMARY, in sense, when water is the medium, than when mud, slime, insensibility, sleep, stupor, grief, poverty, passion, or any thing else, is the medium. Moreover, the sense is equally literal in all these cases; not because of any influence, controlling, or other influence; but because of "envelopment" or "mersion" in these various mediums.*

A man may be mersed, intusposed, enveloped, or immersed, in relation to any of these states, by any thing as an agent, whether by a person, wine, an opiate, or any thing else; and that agent is LITERALLY the merser, intusposer, enveloper, or immerser.

If brother Dale is not willing to admit any figurative meaning or use of *baptidzo*, we will not insist on such meaning or use. But he must not insist on a "metaphorical," and still deny a figurative use, because a metaphor is a figure of speech.

The doctor says (page 94, *Judaic Baptism*), referring to the "baptism by drunkenness," "The passage before us not only overthrows the Baptist theory for figurative exposition by torrents and floods and dippings and plungings, but establishes the true form and nature of a figurative use of *baptidzo* (βαπτίζω)." The author here admits what he labored hard to disprove in "Classic Baptism;" namely, "a *figurative* use of βαπτίζω." It would have been much to his credit if he had acknowledged his former mistakes in "Classic

Baptism." He has given up the contest both as to his final conclusion of "Classic Baptism," relative to the sum total of all his researches, by substituting another proposition for the one printed in *capitals* on the very last page of "Classic Baptism," and also, as relative to a figurative use of *baptidzo*.

On page 84, the doctor quotes and translates the following passage from Philo ii, 478, on "Contem. Life," where he translates (ἡμετέρας) *baptistheenai*, "drunk." Here he abandons his translation in "Classic Baptism." The passage reads thus: "I know some, who, when they become slightly intoxicated, before they become mersed (*baptized*), make provision for to-morrow's drinking, by contribution and tickets."

Baptistheenai is the infinitive *passive*, and does not express an act performed, but a "condition" into which the person mentioned is caused to come. *Passive* verbs of the aorist or indefinite, or the imperfect tense, frequently indicate a condition occasioned by acts expressed by the active form of these verbs. To kill, expresses the act of killing; to be killed, the receiving of that act; and is killed, the existing condition into which the act has brought the object. Here something is affirmed to be done before these persons are brought into the *baptized* or "mersed" condition. This form of the verb—I mean the passive form—never expresses "influence," as argued by brother Dale, but refers directly to the "condition" produced by the act. A baptized person is a "mersed" person, according to the doctor's uniform translation throughout his "Classic Baptism." Every person who is thoroughly drunk, is as literally mersed, or baptized in sleep and intoxication, as any other person can be in water, or any other substance. Their condition is an enveloped condition, as I have shown in my review of all the passages quoted by brother Dale in his "Classic Baptism;" and the *active* form of the verb expresses *the act of enveloping*, and the *passive* form expresses the being, or having been—according to the tense—put into the condition of envelopment.

And although the classic authors do not always mention the thing in which mersion is effected, it is well understood by the cases in which they do mention it, as when they say that the drunken man was mersed in sleep and intoxication. After baptism in water had been mentioned frequently, and extensively practised by the command

of God, it was unnecessary for Jesus to say, "Teach all the nations, baptizing them" in water; and for Peter to say, "Repent and be baptized" in water; and for the writer of the Acts of the Apostles to say the Samaritans "were baptized" in water, "both men and women;" and for Ananias to say to Saul, "Arise and be baptized" in water, "and wash away thy sins;" and for Luke to say that Lydia and her family were "baptized" in water, the jailor and his family were "baptized" in water, and that "many of the Corinthians, having believed, were baptized" in water. In all these cases, and many others, where water is not mentioned, it is clearly understood, as were also sleep and intoxication when drunkenness was mentioned. The criticism of the doctor on the absence of the expression "sleep and intoxication," in some case of mersion, by drinking too much wine, is equally good against water and spirit, when not mentioned in connection with baptism, in the New Testament.

In conclusion, on the mersion by wine and opium, I will admit that *baptidzo* is used literally; and that when a man was but "slightly intoxicated," he had but merely "a sprinkling" of wine, but when he was "thoroughly drunk," he was immersed, in a most literal sense, "in sleep and intoxication;" and, also, that when one is thoroughly narcotized by opium, he is literally immersed in stupor; that in both cases there is a literal envelopment.

III.—THE PHILOSOPHY OF "GETTING RELIGION."

"WHAT!" says the startled reader, "the philosophy of 'getting religion?' Is any one rash enough to philosophize upon this wonderful transformation wrought in the soul by the Holy Spirit? this inscrutable change, 'better felt than told?' Dare any one presume to attempt the explanation of this mystery?—a mystery which, because of its very mysteriousness, is too sacred to suffer the touch of prurient inquisitiveness? whose very sacredness should be a palisade to protect within it the dearest hopes and heart-experiences of ransomed millions? Reason about that which is beyond the reach of reason? But let us see what this vain babbler will say."

Thus many persons may soliloquize. The writer would, however, assure the sensitive reader that he intends no injury, but good; that he is not, technically, a Rationalist, but aims simply to be rational. Nor would he, for a moment, sympathize with that too prevalent spirit of the time which seeks to ignore, or to reject, the supernatural element in religion. On the contrary, he delights in being able to recognize the supernatural blending with the natural, to give a harmonious completeness and efficiency to the Christian religion. Therefore, he would solicit the reader's attention to a dispassionate investigation of the selected theme.

First in order, let us ascertain what is meant by the phrase, "getting religion." All will concede that it is not a Scriptural phrase, but the term religion is. Etymologically, the word religion means, to rebind, to bind again. If the term be applied to persons, this meaning suggests several ideas: 1. A person to be bound again; 2. A person to whom he shall be bound again; 3. That the person to be bound has been loosed; 4. A bond. If we consider this word historically and theologically, all these thoughts find in it an authorized symbol. Under this view of the term, to say that a man "gets religion," conveys no definite conception. If then, we would arrive at the current meaning of the phrase, we must consult the *usus loquendi*—the usual mode of speaking, past or present. Inasmuch as words and phrases are the signs of ideas, and, because neither this phrase nor its

synonym was used in apostolic times, we have evidence, *prima facie*, that the idea is of post-apostolic origin. Hence, on theological grounds, our jealousy of it may be justified.

The *usus loquendi*, then and now, assigns to the word religion a meaning which Webster thus expresses: "Theology, as a system of doctrines or principles, as well as practical piety; a system of faith and worship." The proper reception of the Christian doctrine, as a rule of life, binds a man to God in covenant relationship. The term, therefore, ordinarily relates to the system which a man receives under the idea of a *bond*. This is one of the thoughts growing out of the etymology of the term. But usage has made this the paramount idea.

Can it be, then, that to "get religion" is to possess one's self with the Christian system of truth? Surely not. Then there must be some idea involved by the term, as phrased, different both from its etymological and ordinary sense.

It is certain that this phrase is eminently peculiar to the literature of a special class of religionists; particularly those who adopt the "anxious-seat" as an instrumentality to facilitate conversion. They evidently mean, by the phrase, a subjective or psychological experience—a sudden revulsion of the emotions from a more or less profound depression, through conviction of sin and fear of its consequences, to a high state of exultation and joy, on account of pardon. It must not be supposed that a psychological experience is peculiar to this class, although some, under the influence of this system, have denounced others as "head religionists;" for we must believe that every one who becomes reconciled to God has an experience peculiarly his own. But from the fact that, under this system, this experience is sought for by peculiar methods as the direct gift of the Holy Spirit, and as having a priceless value as the evidence of pardon, it becomes the paramount object of the sinner's seeking. And as this revulsion, by a singular use of the word, is called religion, naturally enough the obtainment of it is called "*getting* religion." With others, the objective point is not "*getting* religion," but getting themselves into harmony with religion, or the Christian system, knowing that if they can effect this, their emotions will take care of themselves. Hence, they do not need to coin a new phrase to express a new religious idea, but simply to use the Scriptural term, reconciliation.

INFLUENCE OF THEORIES.

Every theory determines its own methods and inspires its own literature. The literature of the theory now referred to, is characterized by such expressions as "experimental religion," "seed of grace," "grace of God in the heart," "grace of faith," "getting the power," "getting through," "soundly converted," "hopefully converted," "I *feel* to thank God," "I *feel* to do right," "I know that I am a child of God, because I *feel* it." The emotions are first, last, and all the time. They become the standard of truth, as well as duty. And if, under the law of affinities, the most abundant harvests of converts are not gathered from the emotional classes, there would be occasion to revise all our systems of mental philosophy.

Nor is it surprising that there should be a perplexing confusion of Scriptural terms, in order to adjust them to a system whose central thought places its advocates under the necessity of coining so many unscriptural words and phrases, in order to furnish it a lingual habitation and a name. The terms conversion, regeneration, change of heart, born again, are modified by the phrase "getting religion," or made its synonyms; generally, the latter.

Were it not for the logical and theological connections of the idea of "getting religion," we might tolerate it as a comparatively inoffensive affair. But just here we hesitate. It is affirmed that it is the immediate—without means—direct work of the Holy Spirit; that saving faith is an inspiration by the Holy Spirit, as the writer recently heard in a discourse by a prominent minister.

The necessity for this position is laid in a theory of the fall of man—in the doctrine of total native depravity, as the hereditament from Adam of every human being; that this corruption of man's *nature* is such, that "he can not turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength, to faith and calling upon God, . . . without the grace of God, by Christ, preventing [anticipating] us, that we may have a good will" (see M. E. Discipline, Arts. vii, viii); that man can not exercise saving faith when he hears the Gospel, because of natural inability inherited; that the Holy Spirit must directly impart the power. Hence, a distinguished writer in the *Methodist Quarterly*, of A. D. 1869, page 266, says, "The method of Methodism is *inspiration*, in distinction from *logic*."

The larger Catechism, (questions and answers 25, 26, 27, and 67,) avows the same doctrine of original sin, with the necessity for Spirit impact, in order to predetermine man's will to the exercise of saving faith. In accordance with which, Dr. Rice, in Debate with Alexander Campbell, page 672, says: "Every thing has its nature. The lion, however young, has its nature. . . . Plant two trees in the same soil, and let them be watered by the same stream, and one will produce sweet fruit and the other bitter. They possess different natures." From these comparisons, we learn that man's nature since the fall differs from his nature before the fall, as a lion's from a lamb's nature, or as the nature of a peach-tree from that of a crab-apple tree. But man's nature before the fall was created by God, and was a human nature. He fails to tell who created his second nature, and of what kind it is. Its creator must have been God, man, or the devil. If God, then every creature of God is *not* good. If the devil, then one thing was made *without* the Word. If man, then why can he not new-create himself? That Dr. Rice understands his standards to teach that God's original creative power is exerted in regeneration, is clear from page 635: "Now, if God could originally create man holy without words and arguments, who shall presume to assert that he can not create him anew, and restore his lost image?" This he said, in order to show the possibility of infant moral regeneration, which, but for the logical demands of a theory, no one need attempt to prove, since the Savior has said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." When Mr. Campbell charged that Dr. Rice's theory made every conversion a miracle, he was met by an emphatic denial. But the logic of a system will sometimes crop out through advocates who are not constrained by controversial considerations. Hence, in his "Early Years of Christianity," page 24, Dr. E. Pressensé declares that the Church, "born of a miracle, by a miracle lives. Founded upon the great miracle of redemption, it grows and is perpetuated by the ever-repeated miracle of conversion."

We would not be understood as disparaging the terms conversion, regeneration, born again, change of heart, being healed, new creation, in their Scriptural usage; nor the eminently Scriptural idea that the Holy Spirit is the efficient agent in regeneration; but we do most courageously object to any theory which requires such a set of exegetical laws as makes these beautiful figures mutually destructive,

and arrays them all against every man's consciousness and the analogy of faith. For example, if the sinner is dead, in the strained sense put upon this figure, how can he, under another figure, be diseased and capable of cure? If he must be created anew, according to and in the manner this theory demands, how can he be born again?

RATIONAL VIEW.

That a revulsion of the emotions, called "getting religion," does occur, as is claimed, the writer sincerely believes. It is not a question of fact, but of the explanation of the fact. Those who question the fact, speak unwisely; for this would be to assume that many of the most estimable men are guilty of hypocrisy and downright falsehood—the only effect of which would be to shut the ear against reason, to turn the edge of argument before whetting, to clothe the claimants with a coat of mail more impenetrable than Greek or Roman warrior ever wore. If this revulsion is the effect of an immediate impact of the Holy Spirit, then we must concede all its logical and theological antecedents and consequents. If it can be accounted for without transcending the bounds of natural causes and natural laws, then the opponent must cease to demand for the fact a solely supernatural explanation, or stand self-convicted of fanaticism.

Let no one deny our right to deal with this subject philosophically; for Rev. C. G. Finney, late President of Oberlin College, has defended it upon philosophic grounds. He, more than any other man, perhaps, was instrumental in promoting the great revivals which swept the country forty years ago. His staid, quondam Presbyterian brethren objected to certain "new measures" used by him to promote revivals; one of which was the anxious-seat. In his "Revival Lectures," page 253, he replies: "Of late, this measure has met with more opposition than any of the others. What is the great objection? I can not see it. The *design* of the anxious-seat is undoubtedly *philosophical*, and *according to the laws of mind*."

Singular how extremes meet. Mr. Finney swung off to an opposite extreme from the prevailing theories of conversion, and adopted the anxious-seat as a measure to facilitate conversion, because its *design* is *philosophical*, and *in accordance with the laws of mind*, while others held on to the old theories, and adopted it for the same purpose, disclaiming its *design*. Where consistency lies, the reader

must pronounce. Chide us not, then, nor complain, if we attempt to ascertain these laws of mind, or the philosophy of "getting religion."

Let us look in upon a revival scene. The sermon culminates in an impassioned, rhetorical description of the sinfulness of sin, the terrors of judgment. The peroration flames and fumes with fire and brimstone. As the writer once heard, "Hell is uncapped, and the wails of the damned salute the sinner's ear;" he "is hair-hung and breeze-shaken over the gulf of damnation." The imaginative, no less than the moral, emotions are wrought up to a fearful pitch. The cry is heard, "What must we do?" "Come to the anxious-seat, and the Lord's people will pray for you, and the Lord will speak peace to your souls." They come. Preacher and people wait on them to instruct, admonish, exhort, or entreat, as each case may require, or as the psychological condition of each may seem to demand. "How do you feel?" If the sense of guilt does not seem deep enough, the effort is to "break him down, so that he can neither stand nor go;" or, in other words, to depress the emotions to the lowest possible point. This done, the effort begins to "get him through," or to secure a rebound of the emotions. For this purpose, the power of prayer and song and encouraging exhortation is called into requisition. The penitent is addressed thus: "Do you not believe that God is able to save you?" "Is he not willing?" "Heaven, with all its glories, is yours, if you will only surrender your heart to the Lord." "If you will only give up all your sins; if you will only believe, the Lord will receive you, and give you the evidence of acceptance." "Ask, and you shall receive." "Seek, and you shall find." He repents, and prays, and weeps, and mourns. He asks, but does not receive. A flash comes over him; but it is a flash of withering skepticism. "Surely," he thinks, "if what I am told is true, I would obtain the blessing so long and earnestly sought for." Some one by his side, who came long since he did, rises with a glowing halleluiah upon his lips. This only perplexes him the more. He, after a long struggle, is still unblessed, while the joyful convert by his side has received the blessing after a very short struggle. The thought steals upon his mind, "Surely, God must be a respecter of persons; but if he is, the Bible is false, for it says the contrary." Discouraged, disheartened, and perplexed beyond measure, he sinks into

a skeptical stolidity. His friends note it. They come about him with increased solicitude and intensified prayerfulness. One says to him: "This is a device of Satan to ruin you, when you were just escaping from his power;" "Don't give way to your doubts." "I was just so," says another; "I had a long struggle and a hard one to get religion, but I finally succeeded, and I was *so* happy." "Pray on, brother; we will pray for you, that you may yet prevail." "If you will only believe, God will speak peace to your soul." "Pray to the Lord to give you faith; to give you the victory over Satan." His doubts overcome, at least quieted, by the confidence he has in those who relate their experiences, and encouraged by their earnest exhortations, he plunges again into the struggle. Special attention is now given him, as a brand that must be plucked from the burning. He and others are animated for the struggle with the idea that it is a hand-to-hand conflict with Satan, who is striving, with more than usual persistency, to keep this soul under his dominion. Victory over an opposing foe is always sweet. Prayers go up, earnest, sincere, tearful, agonizing prayers. Songs are inspired with the hope of impending victory. Heaven is addressed: "Lord, send down the power." "Come down, and convert this poor sinner." "Drive back Satan to his own native hell, and give this soul release." "Lord, baptize him with the Holy Spirit and fire." "Lord, pour light into this darkened soul." Meantime, the penitent is exhorted: "Now give up all to Christ." "Hold back nothing." "Turn away from all your sins." "Ask, and you shall receive." "Now, don't you believe?" "Just believe that you have the blessing, and you have it." "Just believe that God has pardoned you, and you are pardoned." "Just rise up, and shout glory to God, and it will be all right; you will feel happy." "Open your mouth, and the Lord will put a new song into it." Then the altar resounds with the chorus:

"O believe him, O believe him,
O believe him, just now.
He will save you, he will save you,
He will save you, just now!"

A heavenly smile begins to chase away the sadness which has hung like a pall over the penitent's countenance. Before he has had time to express a word, a score of happy voices lift the choral halleluiahs, in which he joins with his shouts of joy. "His was a mighty work

of grace." "The Lord was merciful." His conversion becomes the theme of sermon and song, to incite others to seek religion.

How fortunate for the poor penitent, when he was on the verge of infidelity, that his reasoning process was cut short and his judgment overborne by the solicitude of friends! Otherwise he might have deepened skepticism into confirmed infidelity, with the contradictions and inconsistencies of the system. The preacher had told him that the unregenerate can not exercise saving faith, without the enabling power of the Holy Spirit; yet all the while he was exhorted to believe—to believe just now. What? That Jesus is the Son of God? No. He believed that already. Believe that he was a sinner? No. What then? Why, "just believe that you are pardoned, and you are pardoned." Or, otherwise, a man must believe in order to be pardoned; still he can not, being unregenerate. Then, he is pardoned if he believes so. Then, of course, believing that he is pardoned, he will be happy, has the desired revulsion of the emotions, or has "gotten religion." Then, his feelings become the evidence of pardon; or he believes he is pardoned before he has the evidence, in order to obtain the evidence. But did he believe without evidence entirely? Surely not; for that is impossible. His faith must have rested upon the testimony of his advisers, or it was nothing but imagination, or both combined. Of the power of the imagination, hear what Professor Haven, of Amherst, says in his "Mental Philosophy," page 153. This is a standard text-book in many of our institutions of learning:

"Errors of Imagination.—Undoubtedly there are errors, mistakes, prejudices, illusions of the imagination; mistakes in judgment, in reasoning, in the affairs of practical life, the source of which is to be found in some undue influence, some wrong use of the imagination. We mistake its conceptions for realities. We dwell upon its pleasing visions till we forget the sober face of truth. We fancy pleasures, benefits, results, which will never be realized, or we look upon the dark and dreary side of things, till all nature wears the somber hue of our disordered fancy."

It would seem that Professor Haven must have had his eye upon the anxious-seat when he penned this paragraph.

While presenting the foregoing description of anxious-seat conversion, the thought occurred to the writer that he might be charged with an attempted caricature; for, he is free to confess that,

if he had not carefully noted the facts, it would be difficult to regard it as a representation of sober reality. But those who have frequented such scenes, will confess that he might have colored the picture even more highly, without violence to truth. He is not conscious of "having set down aught in malice."

With this procedure before us, we propose to deduce those mental and emotional laws which should be recognized in this process of "getting religion," and under the operation of which it is believed the fact may be rationally explained. In order to appreciate this psychological experience in its varied manifestations, it must be premised that the intensity of emotional activity depends largely upon the strength and development of the moral sense and the imagination; that the intensity of emotional activity, caused under the influence of the imagination, is ordinarily greater than that produced under the influence of the moral sense. But if both the imagination and the moral sense are involved, as is generally, if not always, the case in religious excitements, we may expect an intensity of emotional activity correspondent to the united strength and development of both these faculties, only modified by the degree of precision and force with which the objects producing the excitement are presented to the mind, and also the nature of the objects; for, if the objects be such as are not trivial, but directly connected with our highest interests for time and eternity, they would naturally command our most earnest solicitude. Hence, we would most confidently expect, what is a notorious fact, that the results of revivals, conducted according to the anxious-seat method, should depend largely upon the rhetorical and emotional power of the minister. If he be a man of warm, impulsive nature, with a vivid imagination and good pulpit address, so that he can clothe his transcendently important themes with the chameleon changes of the sublime and the sorrowful, the terrific and the beautiful, the awful, grand, or pitiful; if he can touch every note in the diapason of human feeling, with the exquisiteness and the dash of a well-skilled orchestra,—then we may readily believe that great results will be achieved. Hence, in our time, an evangelist is regarded as little else than an expert revivalist. Let no one think, because the writer speaks thus, that he is opposed to revivals. Far from it. If procured and conducted in accordance with the Word of God, they are great instrumentalities for good. But it is the abuse of them, by

pressing them into the service of a human system, that has well-nigh turned the world against them.

MENTAL AND EMOTIONAL LAWS.

I. We most readily imagine or believe that which is in accordance with our desires.

II. The facility of faith is variable in different persons, on account of constitutional peculiarities, and in the same person at different times, on account of associations, personal habits, or other causes.

III. Confidence in the veracious character of witnesses predisposes the mind to faith in their testimony.

IV. Imagination and faith exercise a controlling power over the emotions. We feel as we imagine or believe.

V. The imagination or belief of a falsehood affects the emotions in precisely the same manner and to the same degree as the truth upon any given subject, *provided* the falsehood appears to be truth.

VI. If the emotions be borne out of their normal condition to any extreme of intense activity, nature demands a revulsion, or a gradual subsidence, at the peril of insanity.

VII. Generally, if the emotions be intensely excited under the influence of the imagination or moral sense, or both combined, bodily agitations will appear, particularly in persons of a nervous temperament.

VIII. Generally, emotional excitement is contagious.

These laws of mental and emotional activity are not submitted as applicable only to religious revivals, but to mental and emotional activity under all circumstances. Without undertaking to prove or illustrate them, which would be a pleasant pastime, if space allowed, the writer appeals to the consciousness of every reader for their justification, confident, also, that the observation of every man will afford an abundance of facts from every-day life to fully illustrate them.

APPLICATION OF THE ABOVE LAWS.

Let us recur to the penitent whom we left, a little while since, filled with the new-born joy of "getting religion," that we may trace his psychological experience, to ascertain whether or not it was governed and explainable by these laws.

Why were his emotions so depressed, even to the very verge of

an anguishing despair, till he could say, "The pains of hell get hold on me?" Was it because of an immediate impact of the Holy Spirit upon his spirit? Or, was it because he believed himself to be a sinner, exposed to the wrath of God? Because he saw, through faith in the Word of God, a hell yawning to receive him, and his imagination pictured the woefulness of its torments to his mind. Because he had begun to realize that he deserved it all, for sinning so long against a Holy God, whose matchless love, in the death of Christ, he had so long despised. Because, too, not only his own faith and imagination had shown him these things, but the faith and imagination of preacher and people had assisted his own vision. His faith and imagination being intensely active, his emotions were agonizingly depressed. (See Law IV.)

But, says the objector, if the Spirit of God had not been striving with him, he would not have felt this deep conviction. Grant it. But did the Spirit strive, by direct impact, or through intervening instrumentalities, in accordance with the laws of our mental and moral constitution? This is the point. If in the former manner, then his conviction had no moral character, for he must have been without will in the matter. If in the latter manner, then his own agency was involved; and conversion is not a miracle, but to be effected in a rational way, although none the less by a supernatural, efficient cause.

Why did the penitent's feelings rebound so suddenly? and why did they not rebound sooner? For, perhaps, he had been "seeking religion" for weeks—may be months. In favor of this revulsion several principles conspired: 1. He earnestly desired and sought for the pardon of his sins. (See Law I.) 2. He had confidence in his religious advisers, who testified that God would pardon him, and gave their own experience in proof. (See Law III.) 3. Nature demands a rebound of the emotions when borne away to a given extreme. (See Law VI.) 4. Many around him were happy, having recently "gotten religion;" others were happy in the demonstrative joy of the new converts, and in the faith of their own salvation. (See Law VIII.) Why, then, should he not find the object of his seeking sooner? His faith and imagination combined to depress his emotions; why did they not, under these seemingly favorable circumstances, combine to exalt them to the acme of peace and joy? Here is the puzzle, if conversion, or "getting religion," is an effect of the direct, immediate

operation of the Holy Spirit. Does not the Holy Spirit aim at and desire every sinner's conversion? Had not many already been converted, who came to the anxious-seat long since this penitent came? Why, then, is he not converted sooner? Perhaps this explanation may avail us: The Word of God testifies plainly against sin, showing us also its sinfulness and its punishment; also, of the love of God, and the death of Jesus for the sinner. The Holy Spirit had laid a broad foundation for the penitent's faith in regard to his lost condition without Christ. That same Word had deigned to assist his imagination by such representations of the fearful consequences of sin as were calculated to give activity to his imagination. We can readily understand how he was "pricked to the heart;" how he was prostrated under a sense of guilt and fearful apprehension. But in vain does the poor man search the Word of God for a promise of pardon connected with the anxious-seat. In vain does he search the Divine record for an example of conversion according to this method. The broad foundation where he rested his faith for conviction, is now wanting. He is dependent upon the testimony of men, that God will forgive his sins in this way. The fact that, in giving his experience, he may rest his faith upon some promise contained in the Scriptures, does not change the fact that the testimony of men is the real basis of his faith; for, if there is no promise of God connected with the anxious-seat, or if this method of conversion is unscriptural, then, of course, all promises construed with it are misapplied, and therefore cease to be the testimony of God, and become simply the testimony of men,—just as the Scripture quoted by Satan, when tempting the Savior, ceased to be the Word of God, and, as then applied, became simply a positive falsehood. Perhaps the convert was like Thomas, constitutionally incredulous; not inclined to believe, ordinarily, without palpable evidence. Perhaps he may have become slow to believe the testimony of men, because his confidence had been violently shattered or weakened by human treachery and deception. Perhaps his own personal habits may have replaced a confiding disposition. (See Law II.) If any or all these things were true of him, it is easily explained why he did not "get religion" sooner. Still, the very fact that he "got religion" at all, indicates a preponderance of the favorable influences over the adverse. Now, the revulsion being at last secured, perhaps under a tremendous pressure of the imagination, combined with

what strength of faith he was able to command, may be carried up to the most intense emotional excitement, producing bodily agitations of the most astonishing violence; or, the physical powers sometimes whelmed with the emotional flood, the man sinks into a semi-conscious state, when he is said to be in a trance. (See Law VII.) Then the mind is given up to the most delightful visions. This used to be regarded as evidence of an unusual display of the power of the Holy Spirit.

Seeing that similar revolutions of the feelings, as well as bodily agitations, sometimes take place where no one contends that the Holy Spirit has any thing to do with them, suppose it should turn out that the Holy Spirit has nothing to do with many of these supposed "sound conversions;" that there is a clear *non causa pro causa* committed,—then they would simply fall under and be explained by Law V. The belief or imagination of a falsehood upon any given subject will produce precisely the same emotional effect as the truth upon that subject, if the falsehood be accepted as truth. When Jacob saw the blood-stained coat of his son Joseph, he accepted it as evidence of his death. Doubtless his imagination painted fearful and heart-rending pictures of his son's fatal struggle with the wild beasts. He believed a lie. Joseph was not dead. But would his sorrow have been more pungent and agonizing if Joseph had actually been dead? Then, what a revulsion in his emotions when he afterward believed him to be alive, and next to the throne of Egypt! What a culmination of his joy, when the aged patriarch fell upon Joseph's neck and kissed him, amid the splendors of his royal estate!

The pious Catholic goes to confessional with a heavy heart; confessing his sins, he receives the declaration of absolution from the priest, and departs a happy man. The pagan, too, distressed and agonized by a sense of guilt, offers his atoning sacrifice, and then rejoices with a joy unspeakable. Men under delusion may believe a lie, be happy, and yet be lost.

RESULTS OF THE SYSTEM.

The worst is not yet. According to Law VI, nature demands a subsidence of excessive emotional excitement, whether the emotion be pleasant or painful. The new convert naturally measures the evidence of his pardon by the nature and volume of his feelings. As

the volume of joy diminishes and temptations crowd upon him, he begins to sing, in a doleful tone :

" 'Tis a point I long to know—
Oft it causes anxious thought :
Do I love the Lord or no ?
Am I his, or am I not ? "

Sentiments about as unscriptural as the system which inspired them. What wonder that these doubts have ended so often in an incorrigible apostasy? *The Methodist*, one of the ablest papers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, declares that eighty out of every hundred of their converts fall away. So unstable were they, that another human expedient must be devised, not only unscriptural, but anti-scriptural and ruinous,—*take them on six months' trial*. Every theory works out through its appropriate forms.

Another class are made infidels because they can not "get religion." Failing to distinguish between religion and its abuse, they, like Gibbon, condemn it as a whole, because of their disgust with the abuse.

Another class are made hypocrites. Under the pressure of a public commitment, by going to the anxious-seat, they feign what they do not feel, or studiously conceal what, if revealed, would forfeit the good opinion of others. It is not averred, here, that there are more hypocrites among those who believe in the anxious-seat than among others, but that with a certain class there is a *direct tendency* in the system to produce hypocrisy ; while, under the simple Gospel, if men are hypocrites, they must be so despite the system.

There is still another more pitiable class—those who, having been long under conviction and fruitless agony, failing to find relief, and concluding that they have committed the unpardonable sin, under the operation of Law VI, become hopelessly insane. Asylum records will abundantly corroborate this statement.

Another fearful result is a wide-spread indifference to all religion. Apostasy is the rule ; or those who remain steadfast are only as one to five, according to the New York *Methodist*. The last state of the apostate is, uniformly, worse than the first. It is always more difficult to stir his religious consciousness. What, then, must be the effect upon the eighty out of every hundred converts—to say nothing of the indurating influence of so much apostasy upon the public mind—but *indifference to all religion* ? Of course, apostasy may and

does occur under any system; but it is one thing to facilitate it by a system, and quite another thing to have it occur against a system.

A CORRUPTION OF THE GOSPEL.

President Finney admits it. On page 254, after contending that it is necessary to have a test for the sinner's faith, he further says:

"The Church has always felt it necessary to have something of the kind to answer this very purpose. In the days of the apostles, *baptism* answered this purpose. The Gospel was preached to the people, and then all those who were willing to be on the side of the Lord, were called on to be *baptized*. It held the precise place that the anxious-seat does now, as a public manifestation of their determination to be Christians."

Baptism is confessedly a Divine command. Who authorized its substitution, for any purpose, with the anxious-seat? That is a small matter, however, if it is only a "*mere form*," or if only "*something of the kind*" of the anxious-seat. In apostolic times "*the Gospel was preached, and those who were willing to be on the side of the Lord, were called on to be baptized.*" Now they are called to the anxious-seat. "*It held the precise place that the anxious-seat does now.*" Exactly. Hence a new Gospel. "He that believeth and cometh to the anxious-seat, shall be saved." "Repent and come to the anxious-seat, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." "And he *commanded* them to come to the anxious-seat, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ." "Arise and come to the anxious-seat, and wash away your sins, calling on the name of the Lord." "The like figure whereunto even the anxious-seat doth also now save us." "Know you not that so many of you as have come to the anxious-seat, have put on Christ?" Is this a perversion of the Gospel, or another gospel? If the anxious-seat occupies the place of baptism, of course it is a command of God, and the promises which He attached to baptism, must be attached to it; hence, baptism is pushed out of its place in the plan of pardon. It becomes a mere "Church ordinance," to be changed at pleasure, as to its form and uses. (See Bishop Gilbert's "Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles," page 251.)

SANCTIFICATION,

Otherwise Perfectionism, is simply anxious-seat conversion *in extenso*. It is a subjective, or psychological experience, produced in the

same manner as "getting religion," and explainable by the same laws. It is less frequently enjoyed, however, because the people generally have less faith in the doctrine; hence, fewer persons attempt the experiment.

THE WAY OUT OF CONFUSION.

"Preach the Word." Show the people their sins and their consequences. The love of God in Christ manifested. If they believe, and are "pricked in the heart," or become convicted of sin, and cry out, "What must we do?" tell them, as of old, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Do not seek to work up the feelings by artificial means. Do not call into play the pride of character by public commitment, before the heart is ready. How often do we hear the preacher say, "Now, if you wish to go to heaven [who does not?], rise up." "If you wish the prayers of the Lord's people [who does not?], rise up." "Now, all who have voted that they wish to go to heaven, that they desire the prayers of the Lord's people, come to the anxious-seat." Ah, the trick! the trick!! thinks many a person who has voted, and instantly he is filled with disgust. People will endure, or even applaud, strategy; but not in religion.

Again: the religious sensibilities always shrink from public exposure, unless the will is won over. To have one's incipient religious experience displayed before the prurient gaze, or to be bandied about by the gossiping tongue, is exceedingly repulsive to a person whose sense of propriety is well developed. Many a sinner's thoughts have been drawn off in the attempted reconciliation of himself to this unscriptural procedure, when they ought to have been engaged in the work of reconciling himself to God. Let the struggle begin and go forward to a final issue without ostentation, then it will be time for public commitment to Christianity. If the friendly counsel of proper persons may be given quietly, to lead the soul out of its entanglements, and break its sinful alliances, it is well. Reason, propriety, philosophy, and Scripture concur to demand this course.

If the subject is ignorant of Christ as the Savior, tell him first, as Paul did the jailor, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and you shall be saved." As soon as he expresses a willingness to receive

Christ, "speak to him the Word of the Lord," for his enlightenment as to the Lord's means of salvation, and through repentance he will soon find his way to baptism, and come again rejoicing through faith. (See Acts xvi.) If he be a believing penitent, like Saul at Damascus, tell him to "arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord." In short, give to each, according to his condition, a portion of the Word suited to his case, in due season. Never mind your theories; speak the Word.

But, says the objector, must we rule out a psychological experience? Must we simply have a "head-religion," without any heart in it? No; by no means. Nor will there be the least danger, if we cling to the apostolic methods. The revulsion of the emotions from the pungency of conviction to the exhilaration of joy will always be secured, if the sinner really believes that he is pardoned, although he may believe a falsehood. (See Laws IV, V.) It matters not upon what kind of testimony his faith may rest. If, then, he be led to a hearty, intelligent submission to Christ, according to the Gospel plan, his belief that he is pardoned will rest, not upon the testimony of men, nor upon imagination, but upon the express promises of God, which can never fail. The Pentecostan converts began to be glad as soon as they learned from Peter that they could be saved. "They gladly received the Word," and were baptized the same day. But they were more joyful still, afterward, when they were able, through their faith and obedience, to appropriate the Divine promises. Then "they, continuing daily, with one accord, in the temple, and breaking of bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, *praising* God, and having favor with all the people."

IV.—THE VATICAN COUNCIL AND THE OLD CATHOLICS.

The Old Catholic Church; or, the History, Doctrine, Worship, and Polity of the Christians, traced from the Apostolic Age to the Establishment of the Pope as a Temporal Sovereign, A. D. 755. By W. D. KILLEN, D. D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1871.

The Family and the Church. Advent Conferences of Notre-Dame, Paris, 1866-7, 1868-9. By the Rev. Father HYACINTHE, late Superior of the Barefooted Carmelites of Paris. Edited by LEONARD WOOLSEY BACON. With an Introduction by JOHN BIGELOW, ESQ. New York: G. P. Putnam & Son. London: S. Low, Son & Marston. 1870.

An Inside View of the Vatican Council: In the Speech of the Most Reverend Archbishop KENRICK, of St. Louis. Edited by LEONARD WOOLSEY BACON, with Notes and Additional Documents. American Tract Society, New York.

Pope Honorius and the Sixth General Council. By CARL JOSEPH HEFELE, Bishop of Rottenberg. *The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review*, April, 1872.

WHEN Pius IX issued his Bull convoking the Council of the Vatican, men were generally struck with surprise. Three centuries had elapsed since, soon after Luther had made the success of Protestantism sure, the Council of Trent (1542-1563) had, as was thought, completed and consolidated the Roman system; the temper of the times did not seem favorable to the revival of these antique assemblies; and no good reason why the Catholic pastors should be called together in Ecumenical Council could be discovered. The Bull was vague in its terms, and many high Catholic authorities constantly asseverated that they knew nothing of the Pope's purposes. But, from the first, the object of the Council was clear enough to all observing students of the Catholic question. These saw that nothing less than a determination to secure a conciliar declaration of his own infallibility had led the Pope to post his Bull of Indiction on the walls of St. John Lateran. As the 8th of December, 1869, drew near, it became clearer and clearer that they were right. When the Council opened, and the infallibility *schema* was promptly submitted by the Pope's direction, even those who had at first been in doubt as

to its purpose, wondered that they had ever regarded its convocation mysterious. When, on the 18th of July, 1870, the Pope, "with the approbation of the Holy Council, for an everlasting remembrance," declared: "We teach and define it to be a dogma divinely revealed, that when the Roman Pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*—that is, when in the exercise of his office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, he defines that a doctrine of faith or morals is to be held by the universal Church—he possesses, through the Divine assistance promised to him in the blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed his Church to be endowed, in defining a doctrine regarding faith or morals; and, therefore, that such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable themselves, and not by force of the consent of the Church thereto,"*—when the Pope had thus declared, backed by the *placets* of the bishops, the Roman Catholic Church had broken with the past and made a new departure. However long or checkered her future career, the Vatican Council is the point from which it will be surveyed by the historian.

When it became obvious to the dullest capacity that the Council would authorize the blasphemous proclamation just quoted, it was constantly predicted that the result would be a violent schism in the Church, and perhaps its disruption. Nothing was more natural than for the general observer—for one who had never made the history and logic of the Roman system a special study—to think so. From his stand-point, such a catastrophe was inevitable. Long before the fathers convened in Rome, it was apparent that the new dogma would be strenuously opposed in the Council by the larger part of its ability, learning, and character. The Papal demand was, that the bishops should renounce the past, and surrender what little independence a long series of successful Papal usurpations had left them. The Pope, and his keepers, the Jesuits, anticipated opposition, and they took every precaution to render it nugatory; the most effective of which was convoking the Council in Rome, and even in the Pope's own palace, where their peculiar enginery could play with most effect; and where, of all places in Christendom, ability, learning, and character would have least weight. It was as though a President of the United States, who desired a renomination at the hands of his party, should bring the nominating convention into the White House in

* *The American Annual Cyclopaedia*, 1870, page 651.

Washington; rather, it would be like this, if the American people had lost their independence of character, and had become accustomed to look to the National Capital for direction. It early became apparent that the Papal party would have their way; they greatly outnumbered their opponents; and yet those who predicted a schism abated not one jot of their confidence. It was asserted that the anti-infallibilists *never would accept* the dogma; and how much reason there was on the side of those who thought so, will be seen when we go a little deeper into the merits of the controversy.

No man, of body of men, ever occupied a more vulnerable position than the one assumed by the Papal party. It is true the Catholic assailant had not the full vantage-ground of the Protestant, since he accepts the Church as an authoritative expounder of Scripture, and tradition as of equal value with the Bible; but the wide field of history was open to him, and he hastened to improve his advantage. He moved upon two lines of argument with demonstrative power:

1. Have the Popes, as "pastors and teachers of all Christians," been inerrant in defining faith and morals? or have they, *ex cathedra*, taught error?

2. Is the dogma of the Pope's personal infallibility a part of the traditional faith of the Church? or is it an innovation?

These two questions strike to the very heart of the subject, so far as it is in controversy among Catholics. The first, because if Popes, even one, have taught error, they can not be infallible; the second, because nothing is Catholic doctrine unless it has been received *always, every-where*, and by *every body*,—Pius even prefacing the proclamation of his own infallibility with, "Holding faithfully to the tradition which ascends to the commencement of the Christian faith."

In the early days of the Vatican Council, Carl Joseph Hefele was consecrated Bishop of Rottenberg, Germany. He had taught theology thirty years, as a member of the Catholic Faculty at Tübingen, and had won a world-wide reputation as a learned, impartial, and amiable writer. No living man understood the history of the Catholic Church better than he. On the 5th of May, 1870, he published at Rome an essay in Latin, afterward republished in German, in Germany, on "Pope Honorius and the Sixth General Council," in which he canvassed, with the fullest scholarship and the most judicial impartiality, the question whether Pope Honorius (625-38) had taught

heresy in the controversy touching the *two wills* or *energies* of Christ, and whether he had been condemned for heresy by the Council of Constantinople (680-81). Hefele divided his inquiry into three parts: (1.) "Did Honorius prescribe, *ex cathedra*, as a dogma of the faith, what was in fact heretical?" (2.) "Did a General Council claim for itself the right of *passing sentence* on a Pope who had thus decided, and did it *actually condemn him as a heretic*?" (3.) "How was this condemnation received and judged by contemporaries, especially by Roman Pontiffs?" He answered the first two questions affirmatively, and sustained his answers by the most overwhelming proofs. He showed, further, that the Papal legates at Constantinople acquiesced in the decision of the Council; that Agatho, the reigning Pope, and several of his successors indorsed it; that it was reaffirmed by the Seventh and Eighth Councils; that, down to the eleventh century, every new Pope, on entering office, was required to swear that a Council can judge a Pope, and that Honorius was justly anathematized; and that for centuries no one dreamed of questioning the action of the Sixth Council, either on the ground of right or of fact. He then considered various defenses of Honorius put forth by Infalibilists, and showed that they were hopeless failures. Nor were these hastily formed opinions. Hefele is best known by his "History of Councils," the most learned on the subject in any language. In the third volume of this history, published ten years before the Council, he examined the case of Honorius at length, and reached the conclusions now propounded in his pamphlet, resting them, however, upon a fuller statement of the facts. In 1870, then, the German bishop was putting forth his most ripened conclusions.

Another prominent anti-infallibilist was Father Gratry, Priest of the Oratory, and member of the French Academy. While the Council was in session, in four eloquent and pungent letters directed to the Archbishop Malines, he thoroughly examined the historical basis of the new dogma. "Do you know, Monseigneur," he asked, "in the history of the human mind, a theological, philosophical, historical, or any other question, so dishonored by lies, bad faith, and all the craft of falsifiers? I repeat it—the question is *totally gangrene by fraud*." Dr. Smith thus abridges Gratry's epitome of the case of Honorius:

"Before the sixteenth century, no one denied that Honorius was condemned by the Sixth Council. The edition of the Acts of this Council, published at Rome

by Paul V, 1608, contains his condemnation and the anathema. In the eighteenth session of this Council, in the dogmatic decree signed by the emperor, we read: '*Sergio et Honorio anathema*,' after which the Fathers of the Council broke forth in a final acclamation, repeating the anathema; the Fathers of the Council wrote to the reigning Pope, Agatho, and named Honorius among the condemned; the emperor issued an edict accepting the Council, and speaking of Honorius as a heretic; Leo II, the next Pope, in a letter to the emperor, also anathematized Honorius, and spoke of his *profana proditiōe*; the same Pope, in his letter to the King of Spain, and other documents, repeated the charge of heresy; the Sixteenth Synod of Toledo assented; the Seventh General Council, 787, and the Eighth, 869, anathematized Honorius; the venerable Bede, in England, reported his condemnation; the '*Liber Diurnus*' (Book of Formularies), in the text of the '*Profession of Faith*' demanded of all new Popes, inserted the name of Honorius as a heretic; the '*Liber Pontificalis*' agreed with it; editions of the '*Roman Breviary*,' down into the sixteenth century, reiterated the accusation, since then silently dropped; Pope Adrian I (772-795) approved the acts of the Seventh Council, condemning Honorius; Cardinal Humbert, Anastasius, the '*Bibliothecarius*' (though an advocate of Honorius), and Hincmar, contemporary with Humbert, all testified that Honorius was condemned by the Sixth General Council; the Greek theologians, in large numbers, reiterated the accusation of heresy and the fact of the anathema."^{*}

But it is time to inquire how our American prelates regarded the infallibility dogma. We must confine our remarks to two, who for spirit and decisiveness, however it may have been for learning and eloquence, rivaled Hefele and Gratry.

Archbishop Purcell was, from the first, an ardent anti-infallibilist. He no sooner reached Rome than, in company with other American bishops, "humbly prostrate at the feet of his holiness," he protested against the Papal programme. In a speech delivered in the Council, he spoke of the Second Council of Lyons and the Council of Florence as having examined "the question of the Pope's infallibility," and of their having "left it in abeyance," because "they could not see their way through it," or "find sufficient evidence in Scripture or tradition to warrant them in proclaiming it." He quoted, with approval, Belarmin's declaration that "there were more than forty Popes in the first ages who taught what is now regarded as an erroneous doctrine," and he asked: "What are we to think of this? Did they teach *ex cathedra*?" The archbishop cited the pretensions of the Popes of the Middle Ages concerning the two swords, temporal and spiritual, and said "he could not find a trace of authority for it in the Bible." He also exposed the vagueness of the phrase, *ex cathedra*, and

^{*} *The Presbyterian Quarterly*, etc., April, 1872.

demanded "to know *when* he was to obey the Pope as the infallible expounder of the law of God and the teachings of tradition."*

The other American prelate who won a wide reputation as an anti-infallibilist, was Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis. He published a complete refutation of the new dogma, whose history is worth giving.

The Roman *Curia* took every means to prevent discussion in the Council, and there was no real debate. "Off-hand remark was out of order. The speakers must give notice, in advance, of their wish to be heard, previous to the day of session. They must speak in the order of their rank, without reference to the relevancy of any speaker's remarks to those of his predecessors. No reply was permitted."† All the proceedings were conducted in the Latin language. The acoustical properties of the hall were the worst possible. More than all, if a bishop desired to print his unspoken speech, he found the printing-presses of Rome locked against him, and he was compelled to go to Naples, or some other city outside the dominions of the Holy Father, to find a printer. On the third day of June, 1870 further discussion of the main question was suddenly interdicted. More than forty bishops who had signified an intention to speak were still unheard. One of these was Archbishop Kenrick. "Deeming it best that his divine right of expressing his views on the momentous business, to his fellow-bishops, and to others who were entitled to an interest in the Council, should be exercised through the press," he sent the manuscript of his Latin speech to a printer in Naples, where, under the flag of an excommunicated king, might be found that liberty for the bishops of the Church which was denied them in the States of the Church itself. This document has found its way to the public, and we hasten to give some account of its contents. Archbishop Kenrick spoke thus clearly:

"The Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, both in honor and in jurisdiction in the universal Church, I acknowledge. Primacy, I say, not *lordship*. But that the Primacy is invested in him as the successor of Peter, all the tradition of the Church testifies from the beginning; and on the sole strength of this testimony, I accept it as an absolutely certain principle and dogma of faith. But that it can be proved from the words of Holy Scripture, by any one who would be faithful to the rule of

* See his Lecture delivered in Mozart Hall, Cincinnati, August 21, 1870. Reported in the *Cincinnati Commercial* the next morning.

† "An Inside View of the Vatican Council," page 68.

interpretation prescribed to us in that Confession of Faith* which we have uttered at the opening of the Council, I deny."†

The archbishop then examined the various passages relied on by infallibilists, and showed that they furnish no support to their claims. He declared that "the letters of Honorius to Sergius do contain some things which can not be reconciled with sound doctrine." He also considered the historic faith of the Church, affirming that "the opinion of the infallibility of the Pope in the sense of the *schema*, whether true or false, is not a doctrine of faith, and can not be propounded as such to the faithful, by even the definition of a Council." He rested this proposition on the main proofs:

"1. That doctrine is not contained in the symbols of the faith; it is not presented as an article of faith in the Catechisms, and it is not found as such in any document of public worship. Therefore, the Church has not hitherto taught it as a thing to be believed of faith; as, if it were an article of faith, it ought to have delivered and taught it.

"2. Not only has not the Church taught it in any public instrument, but it has suffered it to be impugned, not every-where, but, with the possible exception of Italy, almost every-where in the world, and that for a long time."‡

When we consider how large a number of the higher Catholic clergy entertained such views as the foregoing, we can not wonder that a disruption of the Church was confidently predicted in case the dogma should carry. The particular documents described above may not have been in the hands of the prophets when the Council was in session—most of them, indeed, were not—but it was well understood that their authors, and hosts of others, were maintaining these views in the most strenuous manner. Accordingly, the predictions continued until the adjournment of the Council, and even after; nor have they altogether ceased to this hour. And yet the threatened disruption has not come. So far from it, the ablest and boldest anti-infallibilists, with the exceptions to be named in a moment, have retracted all they had said and written. Of the mighty host who, a little more than two years ago, seemed on the point of quitting the house of their bondage forever, only two prominent chieftains, Döllinger and Hyacinthe, have crossed the Red Sea; and even these, with the small

* "I will never take nor interpret the Holy Scripture except in accordance with the unanimous consent of the Fathers."

† "An Inside View of the Vatican Council," pp. 106-7.

‡ "An Inside View of the Vatican Council," pp. 138-9.

band that follows them, seem as likely to perish in the wilderness as to reach the promised land of liberty and truth. In tendering his submission, Hefele said, "The peace and unity of the Church is so great a good, that great and heavy personal sacrifices may be made for it." On his dying bed, Gratry wrote, "accepting the decrees of the Vatican Council. Every thing to the contrary I may have written before the decision, I efface."* Standing in a public hall in the city of his Cathedral Church, Archbishop Purcell said, "I want the editors of newspapers and reporters to send it on the wings of the press, North, South, East, and West, that John B. Purcell is one of the most faithful Catholics that ever swore allegiance to the Church." We have not in our possession any public recantation of Kenrick's; but it is well understood that he has made his submission.

In the future, these facts will furnish the historian an interesting study in history and psychology. Here were men of acknowledged ability, learning, and character, who had mastered the doctrine and history of the Catholic Church as thoroughly as the mind can master so large a subject; they deliberately made up their minds that Papal infallibility was not found in Scripture or in tradition, and they so published to the world; their whole manner and spirit showed they were uttering convictions as profound as they were capable of holding; and yet, without one particle of new evidence, at the bidding of the Pope and the majority of the Council, they cover themselves with the grossest self-stultification, make the most humiliating and enslaving submission that a human being can make—the submission of his soul to human authority—and join in the brutal hunt of their late associates who have the fortitude to remain faithful to the former

*Father Hyacinthe wrote to Gratry a ringing letter, rebuking him for his tame submission. This is a specimen paragraph: "What! Reverend Father! Only a few months ago you suddenly arose, like a prophet in the confusion of Israel, and you assured us that you had received orders from God, and that, for the purpose of fulfilling them, you were ready to suffer whatever it was necessary to suffer! You wrote that demonstration, as logical as it was eloquent, which people might insult, but not refute; and, after having established by facts that the question of infallibility is a gangrened question—to use your own expression—you uttered in your holy indignation that cry which still resounds, '*Numquid Deus indiget mendaci vestro?*'—'Has God need of your falsehoods?' And now, before so many consciences which you have disturbed and left in suspense, you content yourself with writing to your bishop, with an ease of manner calculated to surprise and sadden: 'I wish, Monseigneur, merely to say to you, what, it seems to me, it was not even necessary to say, namely, that I accept, like all my sacerdotal brethren, the decrees of the Vatican Council. Every thing to the contrary that I may have written on this subject, I efface.' Is it thus, then, that the truth and the conscience in the Church of Jesus Christ are henceforth to be treated."

teaching of their present persecutors. How are we to resolve this curious problem? We may well linger over the question; for an answer will at once account for the apostasy of such men as Hefele and Gratry, explain why the Vatican Council has not been followed by a formidable schism, and show that schism growing out of it is not to be anticipated. But we must first look at the anti-infallibility party in its *ensemble*.

On the 13th of July, 1870, the decisive vote on the infallibility dogma was taken in the Council. It stood: Affirmative, four hundred and sixty; qualified affirmative, fifty-three; negative, eighty-eight. About ninety bishops were present in Rome, on that day, who did not vote. On the 18th the public vote was taken, the Pope presiding. This stood: Affirmative, five hundred and thirty-three; negative, two. On the 17th, the bishops, who had voted in the negative on the 13th, left Rome in a body; with what feelings, may be imagined. They had fought a losing battle from the beginning, and they keenly felt their defeat. None knew better than they that the ignorance, fanaticism and craft of the Council had triumphed over its freedom, character, and enlightened opinion. They left behind, in the hands of the Pope, a sorrowful protest reciting the results of the vote in the general congregation on the 13th, declaring that nothing had occurred to change their views; but that many things, and they of the gravest character, had taken place, which settled them in their determination, and excusing their absence from the public session the next day, on the ground that their filial piety and reverence would not permit them, on a question so clearly concerning the person of his Holiness, to say *non placet* openly to the Pope's face. The new dogma was proclaimed on the day of the public vote, in the midst of a fierce storm that darkened St. Peter's—a prelude to that storm of war which immediately burst over Europe, and stayed not in its course until the Pope's throne and that of Napoleon, the eldest son of the Church, had been swept away. In August the Council was adjourned until the 11th of November; but by that time the Papal city was in the hands of Victor Emmanuel, and the bishops did not reassemble. The momentous events of a political and military character, passing in Europe, drew the public attention from dogmatical and ecclesiastical questions; but a small number of thoughtful observers watched the course of events with intensest

interest, to see what the result would be. The question of the hour was, Will such men as Strossmayer, Schwarzenberg, Hefele, Darboy, Dupanloup, Purcell, and Kenrick humble themselves at the feet of the Pope? It did not long remain a question. One by one they yielded, until, to-day, with the possible exception of Strossmayer, every bishop who voted *non placet* has made his submission.

The overthrow of the anti-infallibilist party in the Roman Church is one of the most painful subjects of contemplation in the recent history of religious opinion. That party was strong, or might have been, in all the essential elements of strength. Although inferior in numbers to the Papal party, it was still formidable, and could have rallied greater numbers if it had been true to itself. Of learning, genius, character, and piety, it had far more than its relative share in the Council, and it represented all the liberal and progressive elements in the Church. What, then, was the cause of its complete overthrow?

The most important proximate cause was this: The anti-infallibilists lacked *the courage of their opinions*. They drew the sword, but did not throw away the scabbard; started on a long march, but did not burn the bridges behind them; their publications were mighty in argument, impotent in conclusion. As a critic said of "The Pope and the Council," at the time of its publication, they "led to no new stand-point, and opened no new vista." Their authors protested with the utmost vehemence against the innovation in the faith; but they never said what they should do about it if they were overborne. In the words of Mr. Bacon, "With the exception of a comparatively few bold spirits, they meant constantly so to conduct their opposition as to leave a good chance to back down from it in case it was not successful." Hence the ruin of their cause. It was not in this way that Luther inaugurated the great movement of the sixteenth century!*

But the ultimate causes lie deeper, in the very organization and spirit of the Catholic Church. In the first place, the anti-infallibilists

* "Naturalists tell us the sparrow abandons eggs which she discovers have been handled, and refuses to give life to offspring which she feels herself too weak to protect. The eagle, on the other hand, confident in her strength, fights for her offspring; and if one is ravished from her nest, she cherishes the rest of her brood only the more tenderly. The *soi-disant* liberal Catholics of Europe, since Luther, like the sparrow, take counsel of their weakness, and, as reformers, have begotten nothing, have abandoned their convictions, as it were, in the egg." (Hon. John Bigelow in the Introduction to "The Family and the Church," page 48.)

were ensnared in the meshes of a fatal logic. The Roman Catechism, published by Pius V, under the direction of the Council of Trent, declares, "This one Church can not err in handing down the doctrine respecting faith and morals." This dogma was received by all Catholics, whatever their opinions concerning the Papacy. But the seat of the mysterious power had never been dogmatically identified. The commonly received opinion, however, was that the Council and the Pope, acting in conjunction, uttered the infallible voice. Accordingly, when a Council, convoked with the usual forms and acting in the time-sanctioned manner, declared, with the approval of the Pope, that the Pope was infallible, that was logically an end of the controversy, so far as those accepting this view were concerned: they must repudiate the old premises, or accept the new conclusion. Nothing was, therefore, left for the anti-infallibilist but to disavow what he had always considered fundamental principles, or dumbly to acquiesce in the new dogma. Hefele, Gratry, and the rest, simply bowed their intellects to an unwelcome conclusion from their own premises. They might, indeed, have denied that the Vatican Council was ecumenical; but the denial would have involved them, even more hopelessly, in the toils of their fatal logic. They would have been confronted by the questions: "What are the marks of ecumenicity?" and, "Who is to decide in a given case?" To leave the question to the individual mind and conscience, would be to affirm the doctrine of private judgment, which is as hateful to the anti-infallibilist as to the Jesuit, and to enter upon a line of argument that will dispense with Bishops, Councils, Popes, and Infallible Churches altogether.

In the second place, the element of authority plays a controlling part in Catholic education and religion. Apparently, the Church has learned from the Jesuits "the precise point to which intellectual culture can be carried without risk of intellectual emancipation."* The Catholic mistrusts the conclusion of his own reason in all matters pertaining to the Church and religion, until they are confirmed by his ecclesiastical superiors. He accepts the dogma falsely attributed to St. Augustine, *Roma locuta est, causa finita est*—"Rome has spoken, the case is closed." He must almost become a heretic before he can even raise the question of his ceasing to be a Catholic. When Archbishop Purcell proclaimed himself "one of the *most faithful Catholics*

* Macaulay's "History," Vol. I, p. 42.

that ever swore allegiance to the Church," he meant that he was ready to abandon any opinion, however maturely considered, to surrender any conviction, however fondly cherished, provided only the Church so commanded him. Who can wonder that the anti-infallibilist, thus trained, had not the intellectual and moral nerve to resist *Roma locuta est?*

In the third place, the Roman Catholic Church is the most compact and efficient ecclesiastical organization ever perfected by the human intelligence. It has all the firmness and stability that characterized the Roman Empire. Indeed, the great politico-ecclesiastics of the Church are the descendants of the great jurists of the civil law.* Now, this organization seems to preserve the Roman communion intact in two ways,—it fills the communicant, who has been reared in its shadow, with a superstitious awe that he dispossesses himself of, if at all, with the utmost difficulty; and it is the most efficient means of enforcing obedience in the hands of the *Curia*. The collapse of the anti-infallibilist party furnishes full illustration. All the appliances, perfected by centuries of ingenious practice in manipulating and coercing the intellect and the conscience, were brought into requisition, in so far as the changed condition of affairs would permit. Fortunately, Rome could not use the rack, the boot, and the fagot; the ordeal was less severe than a similar one would have been three centuries ago; but it is difficult, as it is, to make Protestants understand its intensity. Father Hyacinthe thus described it:

"For the priest, it is poverty, dishonor, under the ban of interdict and the thunderbolt of anathema—the loss of this ministry of the altar and of souls, to which in youth he so joyously offered himself a sacrifice. For the layman, it is

* See a thoughtful article, "A Catholic Lesson for Protestants," in *The Nation*, No. 233: "Now, the thing which distinguishes the Latin Church, to-day, from the Greek Church, and which distinguishes it from all the sects which have broken off from it, which makes it a sovereign power, treating on equal terms with secular governments, instead of being a mere State instrument for the spread of religious instruction, or an obscure association of believers for worship and mutual edification, is, undoubtedly, that it has, from the beginning, been managed by jurists, or men thoroughly permeated by the juridical spirit. Mere theologians or mere moralists or mere politicians would have made shipwreck of the Church as an organization, long before the ninth century. The Christian religion they, no doubt, would have preserved—that had foundation to which Roman lawyers could make no additions—but the Catholic Church, as we now see and know it, could never have passed through the Dark Ages, and come down to our time, if there had not always remained at its head a body of men who had inherited the great traditions of the Roman bar, its knowledge of human nature, its sagacity, its subtlety, its faith in human reason, and, above all, in cultivated human reason, as a controller and director of the affairs of men."

injury in the good name and estate which are not merely his, but which he holds jointly with his wife, and as a trust for his children. If he is an office-holder, he compromises his promotion under an ultramontane administration. If he is a representative, he hazards his election; a physician or lawyer, his practice; a merchant, his business connection; a citizen in any relation, his consideration with a great number of his fellow-citizens. Must I mention, in conclusion, one thing more painful still?—he hazards the peace of his fireside and the sanctity of his shroud and bier.*

In the fourth place, false ideas of ecclesiastical peace and unity had a certain definite effect. Especial pains have been taken to impress the Catholic imagination with the exceeding heinousness of the sin of rebellion. No doubt the peace and unity of the Church is a great good, and that great and heavy personal sacrifices may be made for it, as the amiable Hefele said; but it is a sad thing to see men abandon life-long convictions in the vain hope of attaining it. In this way they only obtain the peace of the charnel-house, the unity of the grave. *First pure, then peaceable.*

In the fifth place, selfish motives, no doubt, played a considerable part in this strange history. In the Roman Church, every thing culminates in the Pope, who is the final dispenser of place and power. Continued opposition to his will means loss of influence, loss of position, and the greater excommunication. Before Archbishop Purcell had made his submission, the *Freeman's Journal* said, "Were he to refuse his prompt and cordial adherence, he would be whistled down with so utter a loss of consideration and respect as would make some apostate priests we know of seem, in comparison, to be gentlemen." When urged to take a bolder stand in opposition to the abuses of the Church, Erasmus excused himself by saying he had no genius for martyrdom! Unfortunately, the archbishop and his brother bishops had no genius for being "whistled down."†

Finally, the anti-infallibilists have tried hard to convince themselves that the dogma is something different from what it really is,

* Speech at the Old Catholic Congress, September 23, 1871.

† "Among the enormous encroachments of the Roman See, which, in later ages, have swallowed up the last vestiges of the freedom of the bishops, is that which is suggested by the phrase, 'quinquennial faculties.' At the accession of each bishop to his office, papers are issued to him, licensing him for five years from that date, and no longer (unless the license be renewed for a like period), to perform certain acts, without which it would be, in effect, impossible for him to continue the administration of his diocese. It is publicly and responsibly charged, in Rome itself, before the very face of the Pope's court, that the adhesion of the bishops of the minority was extorted from them under the pressure of the refusal to renew their 'faculties.'" (An Inside View of the Vatican Council, page 218.)

and perhaps some of them have succeeded. While the *schema* was still pending in the Council, we predicted that the Germans, Gallicans, and the protesting American bishops would yield, and then renew the conflict on the definition of *ex cathedra*.* This has actually happened. Is the Pope always infallible? Are all of his utterances inerrant? Is he never a *private doctor*? The *schema* says he speaks *ex cathedra*, when, "in the exercise of his office as pastor and teacher of all Christians, he defines that a doctrine of faith or morals is to be held by the universal Church." Did Boniface VIII thus "define," when he issued the Bull *Unam Sanctam*? did Paul IV, when he issued the Bull *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*?—Bulls in which the Pope's power to depose princes is asserted? Did Pius IX thus "define" when he issued the Syllabus, which is a sweeping condemnation of nearly every thing distinctive in modern civilization? The question is an important one, especially in those States which have a large Catholic population. The Ultramontanes, of course, hold that all these documents are infallible. But the late anti-infallibilists, desiring to limit the phrase *ex cathedra*, hold the contrary. They naturally seek to belittle the dogma, and even pretend that it is of no great consequence. In this way they seek to break the force of their fall, and to cover their defeat. But one can not help asking, If they are right now, what was the use of making so much ado in the first place?†

But in the midst of the general apostasy, there were a few Abdiels, chiefly unmitered priests and university professors. These attempted nothing more at first than a continued resistance to the infallibility dogma; but they were finally led to make a new departure—the Old Catholic movement. We propose now to trace the history of this movement, to consider its aims and its probable results.

When the Vatican Council sat, perhaps the foremost theologian of the Catholic Church was Dr. Döllinger, of the University of Munich. He was the author of a large number of learned and solid volumes, treating of theological and ecclesiastical subjects, found in all well-furnished theological libraries in Christendom. He was best known by his works on ecclesiastical history. He had already passed

* Vol. II, p. 419.

† "I was myself told by an illustrious bishop, formerly of the opposition, who has since submitted: 'This dogma has no such importance as you ascribe to it. It really does not decide any thing. I did not object to it as a theologian, for it is not false; but as a man, because it is silly.'" (Hyacinthe's Speech at Munich.)

his three-score and tenth year, but was hale, vigorous, and in the full possession of his great powers and acquisitions.

At the same time, the foremost preacher of the Catholic Church was Charles Loyson, better known as Father Hyacinthe, Superior of the Monastery of Barefooted Carmelites in Paris. He was a man of fine culture, of quick sympathies, and of magical eloquence. He was forty-two years of age, and had been for several years the favorite preacher of the French capital. In preaching the *Conferences*, or Advent Sermons, at Notre Dame, he had revived the brilliant memories of Lacordaire and his most famous predecessors. More than all, he was a man of decidedly broad and liberal views; a member of that brilliant circle of French liberal Catholics who did so much to reconcile men of thought and progressive tendencies to the Roman Communion; for it must be remembered, that before the Vatican Council wrapped the Catholic Church in the mummy-clothes of intellectual and spiritual death, there were men of such tendencies in that Communion. Hyacinthe was profoundly aware of the existence of a modern civilization, and he was in full sympathy with it. To illustrate the richness of his mind, the chasteness of his eloquence, the range of his sympathies, his appreciation of the Gospel, and the beauty of his spirit, it would be necessary to quote whole pages, and even discourses from his published works. In his sermon on "The Church Universal," he said:

"The Church should not, however, be confounded, as it too often is, with the clergy in general, or even with the episcopacy and the Papacy. It is always a grave error to confound society with its government. The family is not the Father, and, Louis XIV to the contrary notwithstanding, the State is not the prince. But nowhere else would this confusion be so false and so fatal as in reference to the Church, in which the government is a *ministry*, not a *domination*."*

And, in unfolding his favorite doctrine of "the Soul of the Church," in the same sermon:

"Whoever has the grace of Jesus Christ, which is not without faith, at least implied faith; whoever has the great spirit of the Gospel, its great, all-pervading charity, the love of God and one's neighbor, whatever may be his involuntary errors,—he belongs to the soul of the Church."†

Again, in his sermon on "The Church in the Family:"

"In baptism, every Christian is invested with a priesthood by virtue of the character which this sacrament confers; namely, a participation in the priesthood of Jesus Christ."‡

* "The Family and the Church," pp. 167-8. † Ibid, 174 ‡ Ibid, 193.

And, finally, in his sermon on "The Jewish National Church:"

"It is with liberty in the public life of nations as with love in the private life of families. No more disastrous divorce, than that between the idea of religion and the idea of liberty. Through this divorce, liberty degenerates into license; it becomes a scourge. Allied with religion, it remains itself, fruitful and glorious. 'If the truth shall make you free,' says Christ, 'then are ye free indeed.'"*

No man could utter such words as these in the pulpit of *Notre-Dame de Paris*, and not arouse the malignant hostility of the Ultramontane Catholics. Accordingly, as early as 1864, the hermit-preacher became an object of suspicion and attack, and soon after of persecution. He became bolder and bolder in his utterances, and his enemies more and more persistent and vindictive. He was admonished by the General of his Order at Rome. Feeling that he could not again enter the pulpit of *Notre-Dame*, "with speech falsified by an order from his superior, or mutilated by enforced utterances," he declined again to ascend its steps; and at the same time abandoned this convent and the garb of his Order. On the same day (September 20, 1869,) he wrote a letter to the General of the Barefooted Carmelites, in which he stated his grievances, and referred, in emphatic words, to the crisis through which the Church was passing:

"This is a solemn hour. The Church is passing through one of the most violent crises—one of the darkest and most decisive—of its earthly existence. For the first time in three hundred years, an Ecumenical Council is not only summoned, but declared necessary. These are the expressions of the Holy Father. It is not at such a moment that a preacher of the Gospel, were he the least of all, can consent to hold his peace, like the 'dumb dogs of Israel'—treacherous guardians, whom the prophet reproaches because they could not bark. *Canes multi, non valentes latrare.* . . .

"I lift up, then, before the Holy Father, and before the Council, my protest as a Christian and a priest against those doctrines and practices which call themselves Roman, but are not Christian; and which, making encroachments ever bolder and more deadly, tend to change the constitution of the Church, the substance as well as the form of its teaching, and even the spirit of its piety. I protest against the divorce, not less impious than mad, which men are struggling to accomplish between the Church, which is our mother for eternity, and the society of the nineteenth century, whose sons we are for time, and toward which we have also both duties and affections. I protest against that opposition, more radical and frightful yet, which sets itself against human nature, attacked and revolted by these false teachers in its most indestructible and holiest aspirations. I protest, above all, against the sacrilegious perversion of the Gospel of the Son of God himself, the spirit and the letter of which alike are trodden under foot by the Pharisaism of the new law."†

* "The Family and the Church," page 215.

† Ibid, pp. 37, 38.

He then appealed to the Council about to assemble, but coupled with his appeal some words of nervous apprehension :

"I appeal to the Council now about to assemble, to seek remedies for our excessive evils, and to apply them alike with energy and gentleness ; but if fears which I am loth to share should come to be realized ; if that august assembly should have no more of liberty in its deliberations than it has already had in its preparation ; if, in one word, it should be robbed of the characteristic essential to an Ecumenical Council, I would cry to God and men to demand another, really assembled in the Holy Spirit, not in the spirit of party—really representing the Church universal, not the silence of some and the constraint of others."†

It is needless to say that deposition from his position, and excommunication, speedily followed ; so that Hyacinthe, when the Council convened, was under the ban of the Church. The author‡ of the Introduction to "*The Family and the Church*," writing at the time of the Carmelite's visit to the United States, significantly asked : "Will he, in shooting the arrows of God's deliverance, 'smite the ground five or six times,' or, like the King Joash, for want of faith, will he smite only three times, and stop?" We shall see, as we proceed with the story.

The silence that fell upon the Catholic Church when the anathemas of June 18, 1870, were pronounced, was first broken by the ex-Carmelite. At Christmas he addressed an appeal to the bishops :

"Look, O Bishops, upon the bride of Jesus Christ, whom you also have espoused, the Holy Church, pierced, like Him, with five wounds.

"The first, the wound in the right hand, the hand which holds the light, is the hiding of the Word of God. . . .

"The wound in the other hand is the oppression of intellect and conscience by the abuse of hierarchical power. . . .

"The spear-wound in the heart—it is the celibacy of the priests. . . .

"The last wounds of the Church, that cripple her feet when she would rest upon the earth, are these: World policy and superstitious piety."

He demanded that the bishops should take the initiative, come together in a council really ecumenical, and should declare whether the decrees of the Vatican Council were binding on the souls of the faithful or not. The passionate appeal was unheeded ; Europe was filled with war and commotion ; the anti-infallibilist bishops were busy

* "*The Family and the Church*," page 38.

† Hon. John Bigelow. This sketch, first published in *Putnam's Magazine*, January, 1870, is the best account of Hyacinthe's struggle with the Ultramontanes that we have met with.

making their submission to the Pope on the best terms possible; silence again fell on the Church, the next time to be broken by Döllinger.

The Archbishop of Munich demanded that the veteran theologian should accept the new decrees. On the 29th of March, 1871, Döllinger addressed him a declaration, in which he stated his inability to comply; but said he was prepared to prove, before the Council of German Bishops at Fulda, five theses "of decisive importance to the present situation of the German Church, as well as for his own personal position." Summarized, these theses were:

1. The new articles of faith have no foundation in the Holy Scriptures. Catholic doctors are bound by a solemn oath, which he himself had twice sworn, to accept and explain the Scriptures not otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. But the Fathers of the Church have all, without exception, explained the texts relied on to prove the new decrees as bearing a totally different meaning.

2. The new doctrine is based upon an entire misconception of the traditions of the Church for the first thousand years. It is in direct contradiction to the plainest facts and testimonies.

3. The bishops of Latin countries (Spain, Italy, South America, France), who formed the immense majority at Rome, were, with their clergy, led astray by the class-books from which they took their ideas during their seminary education; since the proofs given in these books are, for the most part, false, invented, or distorted.

4. Two General Councils and several Popes have already decided, in the fifteenth century, by solemn decrees issued by the Councils, repeatedly confirmed by the Popes, the question as to the extent of the Pope's power and as to his infallibility; and the decrees of the 18th of July, 1870, are in the most glaring contradiction to these resolutions, and therefore can not possibly be considered as binding.

5. The new decrees are simply incompatible with the constitutions of the States of Europe, and especially with that of Bavaria—a proposition on which Döllinger will abide the arbitration of any German legal faculty which the archbishop may be pleased to name.*

This challenge was declined, and the major excommunication soon followed. In the mean time, a considerable number of German priests,

* *The American Annual Cyclopædia*, 1871, page 687.

professors, and laymen had resolved to stand by Döllinger in opposition to the Papacy. A declaration was issued in June, in response to the pastorals of the German bishops, signed by Döllinger and some thirty of his supporters. It declared that the new doctrines "owed their origin to falsehood, and their diffusion to violence;" repelled the pretensions of the Pope to infallibility as "a blasphemy;" and said the authors of the protest could fix the date of the dogma's appearance, the persons who conceived it, and the interests which it was intended to subserve. This band of German anti-infallibilists, strong in ability, in learning, and in character, if few in numbers, conscious that they must give their resistance form and consistency, or see it perish, assumed the name of Old Catholics, and undertook to organize the Old Catholic movement. In September, 1871, they held a Congress in Munich, at which Father Hyacinthe was present. This Congress issued a programme, of which the following is a synopsis:

1. We cling to the Old Catholic faith as laid down in Holy Writ and tradition, and to the Old Catholic forms of divine service; we regard ourselves as legitimate members of the Catholic Church; we take our stand upon the Creed contained in the Symbol of Trent, rejecting the dogmas proclaimed under the pontificate of Pío Nono, as contrary to the doctrine of the Church; we more especially reject the dogma of infallibility, and of the supreme, immediate, and ever-enduring jurisdiction of the Pope.

2. We adhere to the old constitution of the Church; we repudiate every attempt to restrict the right of individual bishops to direct the religious concerns of their respective dioceses; we acknowledge the primacy of the Roman bishops, as it has been acknowledged in accordance with the testimony of Holy Writ, and by the testimony of the Fathers and Councils of the old and undivided Christian Church; we furthermore declare, that a temporary Pope, backed by the bishops who have taken the oath of obedience to him, can not define dogmas; a dogma, to be valid, must be in accordance with Scripture and the old traditions of the Church, although defined by a Council really ecumenical; the dogmatic decision of a Council must be in conformity with the religious belief of the Catholic people; the Catholic clergy and laity, as well as theological scholars, have the right to pronounce an opinion upon and protest against new dogmas.

3. We aim at a reform of the Church which, in the spirit of the ancient Church, is to do away with the abuses and shortcomings now prevailing, and satisfy the legitimate wishes of the Catholic people for a regular and constitutional share in the direction of ecclesiastical affairs; there is no difference of dogma between ourselves and the Church of Utrecht; we hope for a reunion with the Greek, Oriental, and Russian Churches, and expect that the time will come when an understanding will be effected with the various Protestant Churches.

4. We deem it indispensable that the Catholic clergy should be introduced to the study of theological science; we deem it dangerous that candidates for clerical honors should be brought up in a state of artificial seclusion from the culture of the age, as is now the case in the seminaries and other institutions directed by the bishops; we demand a dignified position and protection from hierarchical tyranny for the members of the lower clergy.

5. We are faithful to the political constitutions of our various States, because they guarantee civil liberty and the advance of humanizing culture; we therefore reject the treasonable doctrine of Papal supremacy, and promise to stand by our respective governments in their struggle against Ultramontane principles.

6. We express our conviction that peace and prosperity, concord in the Church, and the establishment of proper relations between Church and society, will not be possible until the injurious action of the so-called Society of Jesus has been arrested.

7. As members of that Catholic Church which can not be altered by the late decrees of the Vatican, we maintain a right to the secular property of the Church.

8. We have already reserved our right in the anomalous condition in which we are placed to have the ceremonies of the Church performed by priests under ecclesiastical censure; but regular parish priests shall be appointed, and recognition of these by the secular authorities shall be obtained, as soon as possible. Every Old Catholic is entitled to apply to foreign bishops to perform episcopal functions for him, and when the right moment has come, we shall be justified in procuring a regular episcopal jurisdiction.*

It is proper to remark that the eighth paragraph of this pro-

* "An Inside View of the Vatican Council," pp. 244-8.

gramme was strenuously resisted by the more conservative members of the Congress. It involved a substantial organic separation from that Church with which they had been identified for so many years. "Argument and persuasion," says Mr. Bacon, "might have failed to change their determination. But what these could not have done, was wrought by the malice of their enemies, blindly working out the plans of God's providence. Eighty parishes, which very early in the history of the controversy had declared their adhesion to the party of liberty, were lying under interdict; the dead were refused Christian burial, and there were none to solemnize the rights of baptism and marriage."* Hence the Congress was compelled to recognize "the anomalous condition" of the Old Catholics, to "go back to the apostolical times, when there were no distinct parishes," and to sanction an ecclesiastical proceeding that it regarded as irregular.

This programme is the official proclamation of the intentions of the Old Catholics. It will be seen that their name is descriptive of their purpose. "By that simple word," said Hyacinthe at Munich, "we affirm our attachment to the ancient religion, founded by Jesus Christ and his apostles, and our opposition to the new religion which the Pope and the Jesuits are trying to substitute for it. . . . Old Catholics, it is not for you to push the Church forward into rash novelties, but to seek in the past the secret of the future." That is, they seek to restore the Church of the first eight centuries—the Church as it was before the separation of the East and West—the Church of Leo and Gregory the Great. They seek a reform, but in harmony with the principle of Macchiavelli: "No institution can be reformed except by bringing it back to its original principles."

All things considered, it must be confessed that thus far the Old Catholics have not met with very extraordinary success. It is true that only a year has passed since, at Munich, they took the first steps toward organizing their movement; but outside of Germany, where there is a hardier religious type of character than in the Latin States, nothing, or next to nothing, has been accomplished. Hyacinthe appears to have no following in France; we do not know that a single old congregation adheres to him, or that a new one has been formed. The Abbé Michaud and two or three other Parisian priests have

* "An Inside View of the Vatican Council," pp. 248-9.

espoused the new cause, but Old Catholicism has not developed any real strength in France.*

A local committee has been formed in Rome; but Italian affairs are in such an unsettled state that, at this distance, it is impossible to tell what it is accomplishing. In most of the Catholic countries of Europe, Old Catholicism exists in the germs, and, under favorable circumstances, may attain to a growth of which there is now little promise. But the center of the movement is South Germany, where it is said to number more than one hundred thousand outspoken adult adherents, among whom is a large number of professors and scholars, distinguished in science and literature. It is claimed that as many more, still in the Papal communion, are decided in their sympathies, and await only its full organization to identify themselves with the reform movement. Nor must we overlook the fact that the Old Catholics are favored by the German Governments. These have viewed the progress of Ultramontanism with alarm, and they are disposed to encourage any countervailing tendencies. In Austria, the Cultus-minister has issued a rescript, denying validity to all religious acts performed by Old Catholic priests, as baptism, marriages, and funerals; but he placed it on the ground that the Old Catholics had no legal existence as an independent sect, and declared that as soon as they should assume an independent position, there would be no objection to recognizing them. The tendency will be to hasten an entire separation from the Roman Church. The Bavarian Government is more than favorable; it forbade the publication of the infalli-

* Michaud goes further than any of his brethren. The following is an extract from his programme:

"All Old Catholics must begin by declaring Ultramontanism to be the corruption of Catholicism, and all doctrinal decisions subsequent to the false decretals null and void. Their only standard must be that laid down by the seven Ecumenical Councils, and recognized by the Eastern Church. In default of a Western Episcopacy, a renewed one must be sought for in the East after union is effected.

"Each Old Catholic National Church preserves, with the common faith, its particular liturgy and discipline; based, as far as possible, on those existing before the ninth century. An Ecumenical Council of the Eastern and Western Churches to be assembled as soon as possible. The Bishop of Rome to be cited before this Council, and, if he appears and submits, to be reinstated in his patriarchal office; if not, a new Western patriarch to be elected. The Council to make such reforms as appear necessary, to be carried out by committees of action and scientific committees,—the former to be employed in organization, the latter to inquire into questions of doctrine, public worship, morality, and discipline, and lay down rules as to what is obligatory, and what optional. The grand rule in all these matters is to be that of the Universal Church, *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*; and nothing else is to be enforced as the distinction between Catholic and non-Catholic."

bility decree, and it has given all its moral support to Döllinger. It guarantees protection to priests and laymen who reject the new dogma; it recognizes the rights of parents in the religious education of their children, thus dealing the Ultramontane priests a heavy blow; and it promises to protect all congregations of Old Catholics, as well as the individuals who compose them. In North Germany, Prince Bismarck throws the heavy imperial sword into the anti-infallibility scale of the balance.

The most important achievement of the Old Catholics, thus far, is their alliance with the Church of Utrecht. This Church is a wave from the Jansenist movement of the seventeenth century. When the Jansenists were driven from France, some of them found a home in the province of Utrecht, Holland. Their full organization dates from the beginning of the last century. At present, they number five thousand souls, divided into twenty-five parishes, with an equal number of priests, and they have an archbishop and two bishops. They profess themselves Catholics, but protest against the Ultramontane doctrines and tendencies at Rome. For a century and a half, under circumstances peculiarly trying, they have maintained, with unshaken firmness, the cardinal principles that Döllinger and Hyacinthe now assert. The existence of this little community was a godsend to the Old Catholics. The latter believe in the apostolical succession of the bishops,* and since there was not a single bishop in their ranks, they were in danger of losing that episcopal virtue which is supposed to have descended from the apostles. But the Jansenists of Utrecht had preserved a formal succession; their bishops, after some delay, listened favorably to the overtures of the Old Catholics, and consented to discharge episcopal functions, as confirmation, among them. This formidable difficulty surmounted, the Old Catholics can perpetuate themselves.

On the whole, the Old Catholics have probably accomplished as much as there was any reason to expect. Great movements do not leap into success in a year. If we had been writing a few months after the Reformation was inaugurated by Luther, we could not have recorded any very substantial results. Still we shall present some

* In a late lecture Dr. Döllinger said, the mistake of Luther's Reformation lay in breaking the chain of apostolic succession. Luther was right to break with the Pope, but wrong to establish a ministry without a regular line of bishops; and by this step he put himself outside of the Church.

reasons, drawn from the nature of the case rather than from history, why, as seems to us, they can not effect the reform they have undertaken. In so doing, we shall not take it for granted that the Roman Church is irreformable, but shall find our reasons in the nature of the Old Catholic movement itself.

1. *Its Incompleteness.* As has been seen, Döllinger and Hyacinthe do not propose to restore the Christianity of the New Testament, but simply Old Catholicism; though it is due them to say that they regard the two as identical. They are awake to the corruptions and abuses of the Roman Church; they are in earnest in desiring reform; they are right in seeking reform by bringing the Church back to its original principles. But they do not go back far enough. Instead of going at once to the New Testament fountain, they propose to stop some centuries down the stream. What the Old Catholic Church was in doctrine, in worship, and in polity, is too large a question to be fully considered here. A very good account of it can be found in Professor Killen's timely volume, "The Old Catholic Church." It is enough to say that, long before the eighth century, the faith had been largely adulterated by the intermixture of paganism; the worship thoroughly corrupted by the introduction of heathen rites; the polity remodeled after the polity of the Roman Empire.* The germs of all the so-called Roman abuses are found, and most of

*"Great part of Christendom has never been generally converted to any thing like the religion revealed in the New Testament. A minority of the inhabitants of the Empire really embraced the Gospel, and were nominally joined by the rest of their fellow-subjects, after Christianity became the religion of the sovereign. The united body, though still called by the old names, was as different from what it had been before, as the mixed population of Samaria, after the Assyrian conquest, from the Israelites of pure descent who had studied in the schools of the prophets. As the great river of America, after its junction with the muddy current of a longer and larger stream, preserves the name it bore when its waters were still clear, so we still read of Catholic Churches of the East and West, though their whole nature had been altered by the irruption of half-converted Greeks, Asiatics, and Romans, since Constantine, himself a half-convert, first made the Christian profession safe and respectable. Heathenism, avowed in its own person, long, it is true, lingered not only in the rural solitudes, whence it derived the name Pagan, but in the principal cities too. So late as in the time of St. Chrysostom, the city where the disciples were first called Christians contained quite as many believers in Jupiter as in Christ. At length, however, the triumph of the Cross, or, to speak more accurately, the amalgamation of the two religions, was complete. The temples were closed by the government, and the stream of worshippers diverted into the Churches, but they brought in most of their superstitions with them; and though the names of the ancient poetic mythology were no longer heard, a new collection of similar legendary lore soon gathered round the most revered personages of Christianity." (See a thoughtful article on the "Corruption of Christianity by Paganism in the Last Age of the Roman Empire," in the *Contemporary Review*, March, 1870.)

them in a high state of development. The Old Catholics repudiate the Papacy as the most monstrous of the Roman corruptions, but they accept the hierarchical organizations of the Greco-Roman Church, including the primacy of the Roman bishop.

The most hopeful feature of the movement is, the leaders plead for an open Bible for the people. Both Döllinger and Hyacinthe have so expressed themselves in the most outspoken terms. In an address before the Italian Bible Society in Rome, the latter recently said: "We are fallen away; and why? Because we have not, to a sufficient degree, drawn life from its source, the Bible, which the Protestants have not always read well, and which the Catholics have almost always not read enough." He continued:

"Let us return to the Bible, and there we shall find the elevation of our souls and of society. By immediate and lively converse with the Word of God, we shall be able to impart to our religious life that personal character without which it cannot exist; we shall rescue true Christianity from the attacks of skepticism, from those of superstition, and from the false affirmations of man, not less dangerous than his false negations. The Word of the Lord is the purified, fiery word, the silver which has passed seven times through the furnace! Let us place the Bible in contact with the family, in order that it may be read in all our houses, and proclaimed in all our temples! From this contact shall proceed the regeneration of religious society, and, permit me to say, the regeneration of civil society. I am not here for the purpose of engaging in politics; but I may say that the great social questions touch the great religious questions of the day. The grandeur of England and America is the work of the Bible. Yes; at the foundations of England there is something more solid than the Magna Charta,—there is the Bible! In order to construct an enduring Italy we must have recourse to the same foundations. I am a friend of Italy, but I am not her courtier; by the grace of God, and thanks somewhat also to my own nature, I am not the courtier of any one. While still young, I learned to love Italy by the books of Balbo, Rosmini, and Gioberti. At that time, according to a term of a haughty diplomat, Italy was 'only a geographical expression.' To-day, Italy certainly is a diplomatic expression; but possesses not yet that which makes a nation—the fusion in one soul of the patriotic with the religious sentiment. If Italy does not carry to Rome a great religious thought, if she enters there with the doctrine of skepticism and the policy of expedients, she will find there her tomb, and, worse than all, a tomb of derision; for on the pedestal of the giants she would have erected the edifice of the dwarfs!"

But while the Old Catholics seek to restore the ancient Church, they are susceptible to the modern spirit. They protest against the clergy being confined in cloisters, "in a state of artificial seclusion from the culture of the age." They question the wisdom of celibacy,

and of the monastic life*—in both which particulars they differ from the Fathers of the early Church. Even in case they could realize their dream by bringing back the old Church, its creeds, rituals, and canons, it would not be the Church of Leo and Gregory; to a considerable extent, it would be instinct with the spirit of modern civilization. Nor do we forget that the Old Catholics are almost sure to grow. Men possessing so much free intelligence, with an open Bible, are not likely to remain stationary. And yet both Döllinger and Hyacinthe are timid and conservative, wedded to what they call *the Church*, fearful of producing a schism; and there is small hope that any movement inaugurated by them, and shaped by them in its infancy, will work its way back, through mediævalism and patristicism, to a really evangelical Christianity.

2. *Its Logical Weakness.* The Protestant and Catholic agree in professing to have an infallible religion and an infallible Book; they disagree on the question of interpretation. The one affirms the doctrine of private judgment, and says each person has the right and is in duty bound to interpret for himself; the other denies this doctrine, and says the Church must interpret for the believer. Both of these views are intelligible and self-consistent. But the Old Catholic view is neither the one nor the other; rather, the Old Catholic accepts the Papal logic, and rejects the conclusions to which it leads. Hefele, Gratry, and the other recanting anti-infallibilists are better logicians than Döllinger and Hyacinthe. The latter, as well as the former, believe that the universal Church is infallible, and that the really Ecumenical Councils—the first seven, for example—are authoritative in faith and morals; and they alike repudiate the doctrine of private judgment. The reformers cling to the name Catholic, and consider

* Hyacinthe says: "The ideal of a monastic life has lost for me nothing of its sublimity; but I am freed from all illusions as to its practical realization. The experience of the cloister, pursued, as I am well entitled to say, with the most thorough earnestness and energy for more than ten years, enables me to lay my finger on the incurable evil of the religious orders in their present form; and I am convinced that a change in the very conditions of their existence is the only thing which can recover them from this decay. Ideas like these began to dawn upon my mind from the first years of my Carmelite life; but I have never thought that they sufficed, of themselves, to release me from the sacred obligations which I had contracted. I would advise no person to enter the convents, such as they commonly are at this day. I am ready to shut myself up again within them as soon as it is agreed to respect that voice of my conscience to which I have sacrificed my place before the noblest audience in the world, my dearest friendships—I had almost said, the honor of my name, and the tranquillity of my life."

most Protestants out of the Church; while Hyacinthe charges Luther with having done as much mischief as Loyola. The Old Catholics are separated by an immense interval from the Ultramontanes in aim and in spirit; they profess, however, the same ecclesiastical logic, without the merit of following it rigidly to its conclusions. We are not forgetful of the fact that illogical reasoners have done vast good—good that they could not have done if they had been logical. We thank God that Döllinger and Hyacinthe are inconsistent, since they must be Catholics; but in the present age, whose propensity is to skepticism rather than to faith, we can not anticipate a large future for a movement that rests on such a feeble logical basis.*

3. *Religious Condition of Catholic Countries.* There is no evidence that the people are ready, as they were in the early part of the sixteenth century, for a great religious reform; on the other hand, there is reason to believe they are not. A correspondent of an English journal proposes this classification of the French:

"In religion, as in politics, there are four parties. First come those who so devoutly believe all the doctrines of the Church that they are not a whit put out by the revelation of a new dogma. Next stand the great mass, who care only to make money, own houses, keep race-horses, and go into society, and who are wholly indifferent about religion. Thirdly come the aggressive skeptics, who hate the clergy because the clergy are hostile to democratic rule, and whose detestation of the priestly order prompts them to declare war against the very name of Christianity. Finally, we reach the philosophers, the *savans*, the men of letters, who look with silent disdain upon the strifes into which Dr. Döllinger and the Père Hyacinthe have flung their intellects. These elements do not offer a promising field for the cultivation either of a new religion or of a new heresy. The women, the *bourgeoisie*, the church-goers, are horrified by the audacity of a priest who braves the Holy See; the indifferent classes turn aside, with a yawn, from any bit of print that threatens to prove religious; the evangelistical atheists sneer at the smallness of the Abbé's rebellion, and examine it through the microscope of contempt; and the aristocracy of culture deem it a trivial phenomenon, belonging to a category which they have long since classified, and which has wholly lost all scientific interest."

This is certainly a discouraging view, but no doubt, in the main, correct. In Germany, whose people evince a sturdier faith and char-

* The Archbishop of Munich dealt Dr. Döllinger a heavy blow in his pastoral: "The author asserts that a purely historical question was here only in the case [he is stating the doctor's position on infallibility], which could solely be resolved by the same means and rules as apply to the research of any other historical fact. By this means the Church is placed under historical examination. The decisions of the Church are submitted to the judgment of the last historical writer, her divinely ordained office to instruct is set aside, and all the Catholic truths placed under controversy."

acter, the prospect is more hopeful. But even here the Munich professors and priests are not *en rapport* with the spirit of the times. In France, Germany, and Italy, we may divide the people into two great classes: The middle class, who are educated and skeptical; the lower class, who are ignorant and religious. The first are not likely to be made religious by a movement so incomplete and illogical as that pleaded by the Old Catholic leaders; while the peasants, who make up the second, together with the women of the higher classes, look upon these leaders as insubordinate and renegade priests, association with whom would be pollution.

Again: we must remark upon the hierarchical organization of the Roman Church. This organization, so efficient in procuring the defeat and ruin of the anti-infallibilist party, will be just as efficient in folding the flock and protecting them against the Old Catholic wolves. Learning, genius, and enthusiasm are not absolutely powerless when arrayed against such an organization, but they are at an immense disadvantage.

4. *The Want of Leaders.* We mean leaders who are competent to the task undertaken by the Old Catholics. Döllinger is a man of vast abilities and learning, and of unblemished character; but he is too old to be the founder of a new Church, or the restorer of an old one; more than all, he is too intellectual, cold, and conservative. Hyacinthe is in the prime of his life, a peerless preacher, and a man of lovable spirit. But if he had the great qualities which constitute *leadership*, in addition to those which he unquestionably possesses, he would not be without a following in France. He would have spent the months immediately after the Congress of Munich in organizing the movement at home, rather than editing a newspaper at Rome. New men might arise, if the Old Catholics could afford to wait for them; but they can not. Great movements have their origin in the souls of great leaders.

It is very hazardous to undertake the task of writing history in advance of its evolution. We do not attempt it. But for the reasons presented, we do not think that the Old Catholic movement is likely to fulfill the expectations of its ardent friends. It has been common to speak of Döllinger as a second Luther, and the movement that he leads as a second Reformation. All such utterances spring from gross ignorance of the man and his aims. We sympathize with the

Old Catholics in their revolt from oppression and blasphemy ; we are not insensible to their great qualities ; their work will, no doubt, be somewhat enlarged ; but we do not believe that they will succeed in interesting the world very deeply in the Old Catholic Church. In the words of an able contemporary : " Those who expect to see the Old Catholic movement take the shape of a new reformation, forget how completely the times and the men have changed since Luther revolted. Thousands will go with it in resisting the doctrine that the poor old Pope is not liable to error ; and there is little doubt that the main body will go further, but not along ecclesiastical ways. They are not prepared to get up any enthusiasm for the early Councils, or to take Dr. Döllinger's account, or the Abbé Michaud's, of the exact point at which the Church became Ultramontane." And we fear there is too much reason for concluding with the same contemporary, " In fact, they will probably be found readier for the easy course of doing without a Church than for any thing else."*

We do not believe that Papal Rome is immortal. Mr. Parkman's description of Spain in the sixteenth century applies with singular felicity : " An athletic man penetrated with disease, which has not yet unstrung the thews and sinews formed in his days of vigor."† These seeds of disease will slowly develop, and finally produce death. In the mean time, however, we must remember that Papal Rome is largely endowed with those qualities and instinct with that spirit which won for Pagan Rome the designation, Eternal City. Papal Rome, like Pagan, must die ; but the manner of her death will probably be very different from that dwelt upon with so much fondness by the ecclesiastical mind.

* *The Nation*, No. 349.

† " *Pioneers of France in the New World*," page 16.

V.—COLLEGIATE EDUCATION FOR THE PEOPLE.

THE interest felt by the American people in the cause of Collegiate Education, has been attested within the last few years, not only by the extraordinary efforts which have been put forth for the encouragement and support of existing institutions and methods of culture, but as well, also, by the attacks which have been made upon them by innovators or reformers, and the introduction of new and rival systems.

Of the former class of manifestations, there have been numerous instances of most praiseworthy beneficence in behalf of institutions of learning, associations of educators, and the alumni of colleges, and educational conventions, in whose deliberations and discussions the leading educators of great sections of our country, or of great religious denominations, have assembled to participate; and education was never so fully recognized as a condition of power and success as at the present time.

On the other hand, the crusade against the regular classical curriculum, the usual methods of instruction and discipline, and the so-called sectarian control of institutions of learning, has been pressed with great persistence and boldness, and has found much support in the views and sympathies of the people. The series of attacks thus made has called forth numerous desultory and partial rejoinders by different defenders of our college system, and at length the colleges of the regular order seem to have appeared, as it were, formally at the tribunal of the public, in the person of a representative of high position and character and of acknowledged ability and candor, to make answer, in detail, to the charges so commonly and confidently urged against them, the response appearing as an exhaustive series of articles originally published in one of our standard reviews, and recently offered to the public in the form of a substantial volume.*

We confess that we have been most interested in the former class of manifestations above noticed; and in regard to the latter, it

* "The American Colleges and the American Public," by Professor Noah Porter, now President Porter, of Yale College. Press of Charles Chatfield & Co., New Haven. Originally published in four numbers of the *New Englander*.

there were no issues to be made on the popular side of the controversy beyond those which have already been presented by its advocates, we should be content to leave the whole matter to the decision of those who, from their experience and attainments, must be best qualified to judge in the premises. But, notwithstanding the zeal which has inspired the representatives of the popular party, they seem to us to have missed some of the strongest points in their cause. Questions concerning the prevailing systems of discipline, the subjects of study and methods of instruction, and the appointment of instructors, certainly do not comprise the *whole* of the matter at issue in the case of *The People* versus *The Colleges*. Availing ourselves, therefore, of the occasion which has brought the latter to the bar of public opinion, and of the general interest which the cause of collegiate education is at present exciting, we would respectfully call the attention of the parties concerned to other and, as we believe, juster grounds of complaint.

The charge which we shall thus presume, in behalf of the people, to prefer, admits of clear statement, and, we trust, of definite settlement. It is, that our colleges are needlessly inaccessible to thousands of young men who would otherwise gladly avail themselves of the opportunities they offer; that they are administered with such awkward adaptation, or, rather, such want of adaptation, to the popular circumstances and necessities, that collegiate education is practically beyond the reach of a great majority of those who ought to receive, and who otherwise might receive, its inestimable advantages; that while there is certainly no lack of sympathy on the part of those who control our colleges toward any class of deserving young men, there is yet, in the practical relations of these institutions to the people, a virtual *procul este profani* written over their portals, and applying to all except the sons of the comparatively wealthy,—so that the worthy, industrious, self-reliant young men of the middle classes are either utterly excluded from the opportunities of collegiate study, or can avail themselves of them only partially, and at such risk and sacrifice as generally to make the attempt unwise and preposterous; that though, with the increased extravagance of the times and the increased expense of living, collegiate education is yearly becoming more and more inaccessible to the common classes of young men, still, no intelligent, systematic effort to remedy the difficulty, promising to be at all

adequate to the demands of the case, has, as yet, been inaugurated; but, rather, the serious nature of existing obstacles is either blindly ignored, or tacitly accepted as a matter of inevitable necessity; and, worse than all, that the munificent gifts of benevolent citizens who have been willing to devote their property to the cause of liberal popular education, as well as the appropriations of State Legislatures and the National Government for the same object, have been eagerly seized upon by the trustees and managers of colleges, and applied in such a way that the advantages resulting from them have been placed almost hopelessly beyond the reach of the classes they were especially designed to benefit.

The accusation which we have here made, in reference to its matter at least, will doubtless be thought sufficiently serious; and it will, of course, fall to the ground if it can be shown that the partiality in the distribution of college privileges, of which we have complained, arises from the inevitable circumstances of the case, and is, therefore, itself unavoidable; or unless we, on our part, can show that it is the result of carelessness, or unskilled adaptation, or the inertia of traditional custom no longer suited to the times, and is, therefore, to a great extent at least, unnecessary. We shall freely assume the burden of proof, and may, perhaps, as well frankly admit at the outset, that our object in thus presenting the subject is not so much to censure or criticise the able and excellent men who administer the present system, as to suggest for their consideration and that of the public a means by which we believe that opportunities of collegiate study may be rendered much more general and available than they now are. Upon the possibility of in some way accomplishing such a result, the justice of the charge we have preferred will of course depend.

Of the existence of the fact upon which our accusation is predicated—namely, that the privileges of collegiate education, under the present system, are accessible only to a favored few—there need, we think, be no reasonable doubt. The conditions of such education are, that the candidate for it shall have at his disposal six or seven years of continuous time, including the time necessary for preparation, and two or three thousand dollars cash in hand, or its equivalent, which he can afford to devote to this object. There is many a young man who perhaps possesses the sum specified, or the means

of obtaining it, and who also is earnestly desirous of the advantages of collegiate education, who will yet reasonably hesitate about devoting such an amount to that purpose; and many a well-to-do farmer or mechanic will ponder long and doubtfully the question, how many of his sons he can afford to educate at such a sacrifice of money and time; while to the vast majority, even of intelligent and capable young men, the object is so far hopeless as to forbid any serious contemplation of it. They could avail themselves of such opportunities as are at present offered only by a severe and self-denying and protracted course of mental and physical effort, during which they might doubtfully endeavor to carry the double burden of study in college and labor for their own support. In case of those who, prompted by an unusual eagerness for knowledge, or a consciousness of unusual capacity, actually make this attempt, the life forces are not unfrequently so far exhausted by overtasking, and so enfeebled by rigid economy of living, as to render the mind incapable of profitable exertion, even if the constitution does not utterly fail under the strain. And in no case can the student who is thus overworked and embarrassed, hope to secure the full benefit which a course of collegiate study and discipline ought properly to confer. The diploma of graduation stands for far less in his case than it would if he could have pursued his studies under more favorable circumstances. The broken constitutions and enfeebled capacities of hundreds of self-educated men, thus injured by privation and overexertion at the period of most rapid development, abundantly attest the serious nature of the difficulty which we have alleged to be involved in the present administration of our college system, as well as the utter inadequacy of the means by which it is proposed, and sometimes attempted, to overcome it. And this testimony might be indefinitely increased, if we could add the unchronicled regrets of thousands of worthy and capable men who, in their youth and early manhood, were accustomed to cast longing glances upon the fair treasures of college learning, but who, at length, prudently though reluctantly, declined making an attempt to secure the coveted prize.

But it is needless to argue that our present system of collegiate education possesses no suitable adaptation to the circumstances and necessities of the great majorities of our young men. No such adaptation of college privileges to the popular wants has ever been

attempted, and it would be accidental, if it existed at all. Our college system, though essentially, and perhaps necessarily, utilitarian in its origin and design, was yet instituted and still proceeds, practically at least, upon the principle, presupposed, of the incompatibility of learning and labor. The immediate purpose in view in founding our colleges, setting aside, for the moment, the ultimate object of advancing the interests of religious denominations, was to educate young men for the so-called learned professions. Boys were taken from the farm, the store, and the workshop, and sent to college, never to return to their former occupations, but thenceforth to lead a life different from their fellows, and above the common industries of life.

This course was natural—perhaps necessary, by no means censurable—so long as the interests of professional life constituted the great object of collegiate education, and a desire to enter the professions supplied the principal stimulus to its pursuit. But we are no longer bound by the ideas and necessities of the past. We ought now to prize education for its own sake, for its effect in ennobling the man, and in developing the higher capacities of his nature, and not exclusively in view of its practical or material results.

The question of the true object of collegiate education has a most significant reference to the subject of our discussion. It is important, therefore, that this object be kept clearly in view. If it has respect to the man rather than to the profession or trade; if liberal education is good for the farmer, the mechanic, the merchant, as well as for the clergyman, the physician, the lawyer; in a word, if it is, or ought to be, for the people, for all who are able to attain it and are capable of receiving it, and not simply for the few who are to live above the common industries of life,—then it is but reasonable that, with the broader scope of education itself, should come also a demand for such a modification of our educational system as shall bring it within more practicable reach of young men in the ordinary conditions of life.

For our own part, we most heartily believe in this idea of the broader scope of liberal education. We believe that it is incalculably important, not only for professional men, but for all who can be brought to experience its elevating and ennobling influence; that it imparts a charm, a significance and value to human existence in all its conditions, which life could not otherwise possess; and, as a

consequence, we believe in a more general and impartial distribution of the opportunities for acquiring it.

The man, surely, is more than the trade, and the education of man as man, whatever his occupation or profession; the diffusion of a generous culture among all classes, so far as they are capable of receiving it, is certainly a not less worthy and important object than the education of the few who are to engage in the duties of professional life. The former of these objects not only includes the latter, but promises even better and more ample provision for professional interests than can ever be realized under the more restricted system; and it is not improbable that the greatest power which shall yet be exerted in advancing the interests of religion and government and practical science, shall arise from an educated people lifting up and carrying forward their instructors and leaders.

Again: the prevalent idea of the necessary antagonism between learning and labor is essentially hostile to the spirit of American institutions, and stands directly in the path of our progress as a nation. Our true interests, therefore, demand that this antagonism should cease, and that labor should be made honorable, as well as more intelligent and capable, by the education of as many as possible of those who are to remain in the ordinary avocations of life.

Finally: we believe that the success of the principles of the Protestant religion and of republican government, the true development of our national and social life, and the right direction of our rapidly advancing civilization, are all conditioned upon a much wider extension of educational privileges, and the diffusion of a much higher intelligence among the masses of the people than at present exists.

In our American Republic the people are the element of consequence. The chief interest of the nation centers in the people, and the chief power is in their hands. All our national hopes are inseparable from them, and with them we must rise or fall. It is, therefore, of the highest importance that the people be educated; that educated men, trained and intelligent thinkers, be of them and among them and in sympathy with them. And, judging from present indications, we can not be too early or too earnest in our attention to this subject. Dark shadows are already advancing across the path of our future progress, which, if we rightly apprehend their character

and import, can never be effectually lifted except by a popular education which shall be worthy the name.

But we must waive all further discussion of a theme so fruitful. Enough, we trust, has been written to make it evident that the principle of education in the interest of the professions, or of those who are to live above the common industries of life, is too narrow and restricted to be longer allowed an exclusive control in the administration of our educational resources ; and also that an extension of the opportunities of collegiate education to large classes who are now virtually excluded from them, is in every way eminently desirable. To show that such an extension of college privileges is practicable, as well as desirable, is the object which will next claim our attention.

Those who organized our present system of collegiate education, though they seem to have accepted the principle of the necessary antagonism between learning and labor, were yet obliged to recognize the fact that not nearly all the available time of the year could be profitably devoted to study ; for, while assuming the disposition of the whole, they have ventured to appropriate to their purpose only two hundred of the three hundred and thirteen business days of the year, leaving more than one-third of the whole time unoccupied. They allow two holidays per week, instead of the one holiday of the laboring man, and devote twelve entire weeks of each year to recreation—these twelve weeks being so disposed as to be generally unavailable for any other purpose. Such an arrangement of time is, doubtless, very agreeable to those who can afford it, and the present system proceeds on the principle that all who seek the advantages of collegiate study can afford it, or, at least, that they must. Thus the whole available time of the year is sacrificed for two hundred days of study.

Venturing, now, to assume that learning and labor are not necessarily incompatible ; that education is valuable for manhood in general, and not simply in its reference to professional accomplishments ; also, that there may be very many young men who would gladly avail themselves of opportunities for collegiate education, and who would be immensely benefited by it, who yet can not afford to sacrifice all the available time of the year for two hundred days in college,—let us see what can be done to harmonize the interests of labor and collegiate study.

Of course, we can not hope, with this object in view, to secure

quite so much time for study as is appropriated to it when the whole year is devoted to that purpose; but with a proper economy of the forces at command, the difference will be less than might at first be imagined. Suppose, first, that we take fifty days from the two hundred days of study, and add them to the one hundred and thirteen unoccupied days of the college year, this will still leave us one hundred and fifty days, or three-fourths of the whole year of study, and we shall now have one hundred and sixty-three days, or more than one-half of the year for labor. If, now, we remember that Winter is the best season for study, and that labor is doubly valuable in Summer, and arrange our terms accordingly, we can, beyond question, give the student two-thirds, probably three-fourths, of the time of the regular college year for study, and allow him to be absent from college for labor during a period which we may estimate as equivalent to at least two-thirds of a year for that purpose.

Suppose, for example, that our college year should commence on the 20th of October, and continue in a solid term—interrupted only by a vacation during the holiday week—until the 1st of May. This would give us twenty-six and two-third weeks, or just two-thirds of the forty-weeks' time of the common college year; and this two-thirds will become three-fourths, if we allow only a half holiday besides Sunday per week, instead of the whole holiday which is usually taken. And without the holiday vacation, the term might commence on the 25th of October, or even as late as the first of November, and still include time enough to accomplish from two-thirds to three-fourths of the work of the common college year; since, by the usual method, a week is practically lost in assigning and commencing the studies at the beginning of the three different terms, and in conducting examinations at their close. But whatever arrangement of the calendar might, in this respect, be thought desirable, there is no doubt at least two-thirds of the study of the common college year may be conveniently accomplished, leaving unoccupied the months of May, June, July, August, September, and nearly, if not quite, the whole of October—the months during which crops in our Northern latitudes are sown or planted, cultivated and harvested, and two-thirds of all the work of the farm and dairy performed.

Such an arrangement on the part of a sufficient number of our colleges, if it would not at once accomplish the desired object of

making collegiate education accessible to all our worthy and intelligent young men, would at least be a most important step in the right direction. Young men entirely dependent upon their own exertions, if capable and energetic, might easily earn enough during the period of labor to support themselves at college during the period of study; and half the intelligent farmers' sons of any Northern State might be in college during the months least available for farm labor, without serious detriment to the interests of business at home. And the plan proposed would be available for any course of study, whether academic, scientific, literary, or professional.

It is true that it would take five or six years by this method to accomplish the four-years' study of the usual course; but with two-thirds of the business year regularly at his disposal, the student would scarcely consider the time devoted to so noble a purpose as in any sense a sacrifice or loss. But, if it were thought desirable, a four-years' course upon the same plan might be so arranged as to include all the essential elements of a high general culture. In the regular curriculum of our best colleges, one-third of four-years' time, including the last year and a half of preparation, is devoted to the study of the Greek language. This language is of little practical value to ordinary students, and passes rapidly from the memory of graduates after leaving college, in a great majority of instances. In organizing a course of study, therefore, for the purposes of general education, the Greek might very properly be omitted, and the four-years' course we propose would be equal, in all other respects, to the usual four-years' course. The boy who should commence his preparatory studies at the age of fourteen or fifteen years, besides laboring during the whole of each working season upon his father's farm, might graduate at twenty-one, with an education which would make life different to him ever after, whatever his occupation or profession, and himself a different and a nobler being.

That colleges organized upon such a plan, in favorable locations, would be thronged with students if suitable inducements were held out, there is not the least reason to doubt; and a system of popular education would thus be inaugurated of which Americans might well be proud. The term would no longer stand, as it now too often does, for the mere absence of degrading ignorance.

When, some year or two since, our attention was first called to

the plan above stated for extending the opportunities of collegiate education, we believed it valuable and important, as indicating, perhaps, the only means by which a high order of educational privileges could ever be brought within practical reach of any considerable portion of our worthy and capable young men.

But having since been brought, by actual experience as a college instructor, into a nearer view of the practical working of the American college system, and a better appreciation of the wants of American students, we have come to believe that the method under discussion has advantages besides those of availability and economy which are too important to be overlooked.

Probably the greatest mistake involved in our present system of collegiate education consists in the tendency, almost universal, *to forget that education is a process of growth, and is subject to the conditions of growth*, and especially that *time* for the natural growth and development of the mental faculties is indispensable to the true success of all educational effort. And the most common mistake of American students is a thoughtless and extravagant eagerness to enter college early, and to secure the diploma of graduation at the earliest possible moment.

It requires but a moment's reflection to see the pernicious consequences of this mistake. If it requires a certain amount of food to develop the physical frame to its best proportions during the twenty years of its growth, it by no means follows that a child would attain the same stature by being crammed with the whole amount of food in ten years. If a certain amount of labor, or of gymnastic exercise, per day or per week, is required to develop in the system the greatest amount of muscular strength, then double that amount, or any increase upon it, will exhaust and diminish strength rather than increase it. Now, it is precisely this mistake which is made in reference to the nature and means of education by great numbers of students; and they are too often encouraged in their error, serious as it is, by their instructors and the faculties of colleges. Their idea of education seems to be, that it consists in getting through a certain amount of mathematics and languages and physical science and philosophy; and, if they can accomplish two years' work in one, so as to save a year in preparation, or "jump" a class in college, they consider it so much gain. It has never occurred to them that they would be more

benefited by accomplishing one year's study in a year, than they could be by going through the work of two years in the same time; nor that the healthy development of the intellectual powers is *hindered*, rather than promoted, by exhausting mental exertion. We believe that the unsatisfactory results of collegiate study, in many instances, are due to the influence of this mistake. We need to realize more fully than we yet do, that true education does not consist in merely accomplishing a certain amount of intellectual labor, nor in learning a certain amount of facts or principles; but rather in performing the intellectual labor and in making our mental acquisitions in such a way and under such circumstances as shall best promote the healthy growth and development of the intellectual powers. One of the greatest banes of American civilization generally, is our tendency to restlessness and haste; but this tendency answers better in every thing else than in education. All forced and premature development of the mental faculties must eventually result in enfeeblement and blight. If we would have full-grown men, with healthy and fully-developed intellects, *we must allow them time to grow*; and especially we must be careful not to hinder their healthy growth by too continuous, tasking during the period of most rapid development. The true purposes of education, therefore, can not be safely nor most successfully accomplished by continuous study. There is need of time, in intervals between the periods of college labor, when the mind shall be comparatively at leisure; time for it to take advantage of the impulse imparted, and to digest and appropriate the intellectual aliment it has received; time for its natural growth and development, and for the natural and voluntary activity of the developing mental powers.

The ordinary vacations of two, three, and seven weeks per year have reference to the physical rather than to the mental wants of the students; and whether sufficient for the former purpose or not, it may at least fairly be questioned whether they are sufficient for the latter; or whether they can be made sufficient, without involving such a loss of time in idleness and recreation as would be likely to exert a seriously demoralizing influence upon the character and habits of the students.

We are far from thinking, therefore, either that protracting the period of collegiate education from four years to five or six for the

same amount of study, or that the long intervals of labor during which the mind would be comparatively unoccupied—while the student would be so engaged as to acquire habits of industry rather than idleness, and to increase rather than to relax his energy of character and purpose—would be any objection to the plan proposed. With the most profitable disposition of the time of the whole year which it is possible to devise, in reference to both labor and study, it still includes abundant provision for the recreation of the mind, and for its natural growth and voluntary activity.

The liability to forget, during these intervals of labor, could scarcely be greater than when old studies are crowded from the mind by the new ones of the succeeding term, as in the usual course; and in any case, it might be easily counteracted by the student who should keep his purpose of education in view; and the advantage which would thus be derived in giving tenacity to the memory, and in inducing habits of independent study, would more than counterbalance any inconvenience which such liability might occasion. This advantage might be insured to all the students by requiring them to pass an examination at the commencement of each term, on the studies of the term next preceding.

Again: it is an acknowledged defect of the American educational system, that it includes no provision by which we can secure sufficient attention on the part of the students to the subject of physical development. The one or two hours per day usually devoted to this purpose by students in college, might suffice to maintain the system in health, if already developed and mature; but this amount is by no means sufficient to *induce a suitable development* at the period of growth. In many cases students need to devote as much time and effort to this important object, at this critical period of their lives, as to the proper studies of the course. For a people so practical and business-like as the Americans, gymnastics and amusements can never successfully accomplish this work. The best class of American students, at least, will never be satisfied to devote any considerable portion of their time to mere amusements or mechanical motions. Amusements, it is true, have their proper place, and a very important place in connection with both study and labor; but if carried far enough to insure the necessary physical development, they either become—like gymnastics in any case—a labor without its natural

reward, or tend to induce a love of mere pastime and sport, and a consequent disinclination for serious effort, which can scarcely fail to relax the energy of the character, and to unfit the mind for the practical duties of life. In fact, this whole system of attempting to secure the requisite physical development in students by means of mechanical exercises, otherwise purposeless, or by amusements carried beyond their legitimate sphere, is unnatural, and perhaps ought not to succeed. That it has not, thus far, been attended with satisfactory success, and is not at present likely to be, the evidences are only too abundant. Nor are these evidences limited to those whose health has utterly failed in college, or soon after graduation, through lack of physical exercise.

We may every day meet with learned graduates, in the various spheres of professional activity, whose stooping forms and attenuated limbs, with other indications of physical weakness, whether a source of annoyance and inconvenience to the possessors or not, must, at least, indicate a greater or less deficiency of practical working force and of capacity for usefulness in life. These men might have been free from these disabilities, had they been engaged in some active out-of-door employment during a portion of the time when they were students in college. And scores of youth, from fourteen to eighteen years of age, apply every year for admission to our colleges, whose bodies need developing much more than their brains, and who, as we may see at a glance, *will never be men*, unless a few seasons of active exercise in the free air shall develop their slender and ungainly forms to manly proportions and strength. It is needless to say that the system of education proposed in this paper is exactly adapted to our wants in this respect.

But there is another view in which such a system ought to commend itself to the favorable consideration of all those who are interested in the cause of true educational development. Labor is commonly regarded as important only in view of its material results, which are indispensable to our purpose surely, and it is in accommodation to its importance in this respect that our plan takes its distinguishing features. We have attempted to show that it is also important as the natural and, in many instances, the only available means of securing a suitable physical development. But it is scarcely less valuable as a moral and educational force than it is in reference

to either of the objects above mentioned. Labor is of universal necessity. Every man's existence must be supported by labor—by his own, or that of others performed in his behalf. There is a weakness and meanness in allowing one's self to be too much assisted by others, even by parents and friends. There is a generous manliness in the determination and endeavor of a young man to carry his own burden; to assist, rather than to be assisted. And according to the relation in which the boy or young man places himself to this universal necessity of human existence, does he become manly and honorable and strong, or mean and dependent and weak; and the elements of character thus developed in youth are likely to remain with him, and to influence his conduct through life.

Again: labor, in one form or another, is the condition of success in all the departments of human ambition or endeavor; and the great lesson how results are accomplished, the lesson of resolution and patience and faithfulness in toil, which makes effort easy and industry habitual, can be learned by the young man in no other way so effectually as by the discipline of physical labor, prompted by its natural necessity, and aiming at its natural reward. It is not only the best conservator of morality, exercising the most salutary restraint upon vicious tendencies, but it is perhaps the most efficient of all positive educational influences, if we regard manliness and independence, patience and unassuming self-reliance, strength and substance of character, and firmness and steadiness of purpose, as among the objects of true education. Its relation to human life, to every individual existence, renders, or ought to render, its teaching universally applicable; and no class of young men, however removed from the pressure of pecuniary necessity, can afford to forego the moral advantages which it is designed to confer. The latter, we believe, are generally far more important to the young than its material results. There is, in fact, nothing which can adequately supply its place as an educational force; and he who has missed its invaluable discipline in youth, can hardly be completely equipped for the struggle of life. Many of the eminent men whose names stand high in our country's history, owe their success and greatness to the discipline of labor in early life much more than to any opportunities which they enjoyed for scholastic education; and it remains, we trust, for Americans of the present century to render this great agent of individual and national development more

honorable than it ever yet has been in any country or time; to render it honorable, as alone it can be rendered honorable in comparison with other avocations, *by the liberal education of laboring men.*

We are here ready to rest our case. We trust that enough has been written to make it evident that the physical capacities of *young men*, even those who desire and deserve to be educated, were given them for some other purpose than to impose the necessity of keeping them in order by mechanical drill; and that they ought not, as a rule, to be compelled to abandon their labor when they commence their studies; least of all, that they ought to be required to sacrifice the whole available time of the year for two hundred days of study, or, in case they can not afford to do this, to forego the latter altogether; that it is time that some effort at least should be made, where the prospects are so promising and the results to be hoped for so important, to harmonize the interests of labor and collegiate study; and that appropriations of the people's money and lands for the express purpose of securing a higher popular education, and the magnificent donations of wealthy citizens for the same object, should no longer *all* be applied in such a way that the people, except a small class, and that the class least needing assistance, shall be virtually excluded from the advantages resulting from them.

We do not assert that nothing has been done to assist young men—certain classes of them at least—in such efforts as under existing discouragements they have been, or may be, disposed to make for the attainment of liberal education; but we do believe that no provision has yet been made, or attempted, which is either adapted to their wants, or which promises to be at all adequate to the demands of the case. Arrangements have been made, to a limited extent, in certain colleges, for free tuition in favor of students who are characterized as indigent, or who are willing to receive assistance on the basis of charity; and, in certain others, in favor of students of unusual merit. But it should be remembered that the price paid for tuition is but a small part of the expense of collegiate education in any case, and if the tuition could be made free for all the students, the benefits resulting would still be of little account as compared with the advantages of a plan by which a course of collegiate study could be successfully pursued in connection with the duties of home and business life.

The manual labor scheme, properly so called, is as yet, and long must be, an untried experiment; and whatever it may accomplish, it does not even propose to accommodate the interests of labor and study on the natural basis of each. It is at home, and upon their farms, that the labor of young men is wanted, and is often indispensably necessary. It is *not* wanted in the vicinity of a university, where it requires extensive and doubtful outlays of college funds to make provision for it. It is not necessary to force labor into an artificial connection with collegiate study. Such a course must involve complication and possibly loss. It is better to leave both labor and study on their own natural basis, so that each may take care of itself, and neither interfere with the other; so that the one may be certainly and satisfactorily remunerative, and the other not unnecessarily embarrassed. In a word, we should seek to harmonize the interests of study in the university with the interests of labor at home. A suitable arrangement upon this principle, if properly carried out, could hardly fail of success, whatever may be the result of experiments in other directions.*

* It is well known that the idea of giving students the opportunity of maintaining themselves by their labor, was a prominent feature in the original plan of Cornell University. After three years of experience, during which this idea has been kept prominently in view, the friends of the institution admit that young men can maintain themselves there only by skilled labor, and that there is not even the certainty of a permanent demand for that; that is, a young man must learn a trade before he can hope that his labor will supply him with the means of education by this method; or, in other words, the so-called manual-labor system of education, in its present development at least, is not adapted to the circumstances and necessities of the great majorities of intelligent and capable young men of this country who would gladly seek the advantages of liberal culture.

The Vice-President of the University, in a letter published more than a year ago, in reply to numerous inquiries,* states, in substance, the above fact, and then significantly adds: "It is hard that young men can not pay," that is, by their labor, "for what they desire so ardently, which would add so much to their usefulness and happiness, and add so much to the moving force of society; but the same has always been the case, and we are now so keenly sensitive to the wrong because we just now begin to see how it can be remedied."

We trust, indeed, that the people of this country are beginning to see how the wrong here stated can be remedied; but we confess that, for our own part, we can not yet see how the manual-labor system is to effect this result. For, in addition to the difficulties above indicated, it is evident that the unskilled labor by which it is hoped that students may at length be able to support themselves while studying at a university, must, to this end, be profitable, not only to the students, but also to their employers; that is, *students must compete with common laborers* on equal terms, or rather, on terms of decided disadvantage. It is, to say the least, exceedingly doubtful whether three or four hours of such labor per day, performed under such circumstances, can ever properly supply the daily wants of students, and defray the expenses of their education at a university. The prospect certainly will not appear very flattering to the proposed students, however it may seem to others.

* In *Harper's Weekly*, of August 20, 1870.

Of course we do not suppose that it will be thought advisable or possible for our old and prosperous institutions, whose classes and divisions are in some instances already too full, to change their established methods in such a way as to interfere with their regular terms and courses of study. Their duty is, perhaps, rather to see how they may best provide for the accommodation and instruction of the students who are already and constantly in attendance upon them. Those who are able to avail themselves of college opportunities, as they are at present offered, or who may prefer to do so, certainly have a right to their way. We only insist that some suitable provision ought to be made for those who are not thus able, or who may not thus prefer. And we believe there are many institutions whose opportunities, under the present system, are to a considerable extent, unimproved—perhaps half of the so called colleges and universities in the United States—which might vastly increase their efficiency and usefulness by reorganization upon a plan like that here suggested. Instead of devoting the time and talents of their faculties to the instruction of classes numbering from a half dozen to a score of students, their class-rooms and dormitories would at once be crowded to overflowing if they would thus conform the administration of the powers and privileges vested in them to the wants and circumstances of the people they were intended to serve.

We are aware that those who represent this class of institutions are fully as wont to complain of deficiency in their endowment as of the paucity of their students; and any inconvenience or reproach arising from the latter circumstance would perhaps, in some instances, be submitted to for a few years with considerable complacency, if the institutions themselves could be placed on a substantial pecuniary foundation, so as to be certain of paying comfortable salaries to the incumbents of their various offices and chairs of instruction. But it may not be amiss to suggest to those in charge of these institutions, that the way to make them the most practically and extensively useful is also the surest way to increase or complete their endowment. Wealthy and benevolent men, like those who have already rendered themselves the benefactors of their country by assisting our colleges, would not be slow to recognize the claims of a class of institutions which should thus put themselves into practical sympathy with the popular spirit, and answer a real want of the times,

and in which they could be certain that their beneficence would be immediately and extensively productive.

We can not, therefore, sympathize with the opinions of those who regret that so many colleges were ever founded in this country, and who would starve or suppress these smaller institutions in order that a few large ones may be the better supported. It is evident that the popular demand for liberal education in the United States can never be adequately supplied by a few great universities; and we agree rather with the opinion expressed by one of our prominent educators in the Brooklyn Baptist Educational Convention, that "*we have none too many colleges, but only too few students.*"* And when these apparently superfluous colleges shall be made practically accessible to the thousands of young men who ought to enjoy their advantages, we shall find that we need them all, and more besides. And for their pecuniary support, in addition to the strong claim which such institutions would have upon the beneficence of the friends of education, it will be found that the people will be able and willing to pay for educational privileges thus placed within their reach, and an increase of income will be the natural and certain result of increased popularity and patronage. And by the successful inauguration of a movement like that above contemplated, these feebler institutions would at once assume a prominence and importance which otherwise they can not hope to attain except through years of patient labor and care.

It would indeed be difficult to overestimate the grand significance of a movement by which the opportunity of a free intellectual development should be given to the young men of the great middle classes in our country, and by which any considerable portion of them should become truly educated. The blessings of a refined and generous culture would thus be carried to thousands of the homes of the people, in which the highest value of existence might otherwise never be known. The industries of common life, especially agriculture, would be invested with a charm and beauty which they have hitherto possessed only in the imaginations of poets, and an intelligent vitality, never before experienced, would be imparted to religion and government and practical science, and to every legitimate department of human ambition and endeavor. Genius, too, would hasten to reveal itself to the touchstone of knowledge, and from the brain of the nation,

* Dr. J. M. Gregory, President of the Illinois Industrial University.

vitalized by its magical influence, her great men would come forth full-armed for achievement in the fields of literature and science and art, or in the various spheres of public and professional activity; and the whole structure of our civilization would be placed on a basis of security and rational progress, and would assume a character of refinement and intelligence and virtue, never to be realized except as the result of a truly liberal and extensive popular culture.

There is one further thought which pertains so naturally to our subject as properly to claim a brief consideration in connection with it. The general idea of the paper above written is, according to its name, *Collegiate Education for the People*. But it will doubtless have been remarked by the reader, perhaps not without animadversion, that we have considered the subject with exclusive reference to the wants of young men. We have done this, not from any disposition to ignore the claims of young ladies to the advantages of liberal culture, nor because we were unaware of the neglect in this regard from which, as a class, they have hitherto been permitted to suffer. But the plan we have been considering possesses peculiar adaptation to the wants and circumstances of young men, and none whatever, so far at least as it has yet been presented, to those of the opposite sex. We have now to add, that we believe this plan may be so extended or perfected as to include provision for the liberal culture of young ladies superior to any which it is otherwise possible to afford them.

It will perhaps have occurred to the thoughtful reader as an objection to the method of collegiate education above proposed—and it is doubtless the most serious, if not the only objection to which it is liable—that it would leave the college buildings unoccupied and the faculty unemployed during nearly one-half of the entire year. This feature need not, we think, be considered a very serious objection; for an institution which, with large and full classes, should accomplish three-fourths of a year's work in one half the year, would at least have a far greater aggregate efficiency than the many meagerly attended colleges of the regular order actually existing have been able to attain, and could well afford the intermission involved in the proposed plan; and men who are fit to constitute the faculties of colleges would be at no loss for a profitable disposition of their time during the unoccupied interval. But the objection, whether slight or serious, need not exist at all. A suitable arrangement of these unoccupied

intervals into the terms of a course of collegiate study for young ladies, would not only remove it, but would also add to our plan what was hitherto wanting to it as a system of collegiate education for the people.

We confess that we are not without apprehension of an unfavorable reception of the idea here advanced, even on the part of some who may have been inclined to a favorable consideration of the suggestions we have hitherto made. But we shall presume to ask for a suspension of unfavorable judgment until the case shall be briefly presented.

The Summer or ladies' term of an institution conducted upon this plan, would consist of twenty-two calendar weeks. If we allowed for only a half-holiday per week, in addition to Sunday, which would probably be sufficient in case of students who would spend so large a portion of their time out of college, this term would be equal to twenty-four college weeks, or only three weeks less than two-thirds of the common college year. Allowance is made in this calculation for a vacation of two weeks in the Spring-time between the Winter and Summer terms, and another of equal extent in the Fall. These terms would occur at a time of the year when no care of fires and no expense for fuel would be necessary, which, with the mildness of the season, affording favorable opportunity for out-of-door recreation and exercise, would render the arrangement pleasant and popular. All the available time of the term should be devoted to the substantial studies of the course. Accomplishments do not properly belong to a course of collegiate study, and should be admitted only so far as they could be made to serve the purpose of recreation and pastime, which, it may be observed, is their natural place and purpose generally. Some portion of the long interval between the Summer terms, which would be spent out of college, might be profitably devoted to their pursuit.

Courses of reading in History and English Literature for this unoccupied interval should be prescribed by the faculty, to be enforced by examinations, and supplemented by lectures in college. These pursuits are very valuable in themselves, and are peculiarly appropriate in the education of young ladies. No student can afford to devote much time to History or Literature in college, and yet the lectures usually given in universities, on these subjects, have little value except

in connection with such courses of reading as are here suggested. There is great ignorance of the one branch among nearly all classes of the people, and great neglect or abuse of the other—trashy, ephemeral productions usually taking the time which under the proposed arrangement would be devoted to the standard works of the language. These courses of reading, with accomplishments, both ornamental and those practical household accomplishments which are so indispensable to the proper education of every young lady, would suffice for the profitable employment of the time not occupied by the college term; while the long periods of uninterrupted study in college, under the instruction of able and experienced professors, would afford an opportunity of liberal culture of a very high order, which would at the same time be eminently popular and accessible. Such a course of university study and lectures would, in all cases, constitute a most valuable supplement to the opportunities of public and private schools, which young ladies can generally enjoy without leaving their homes, and would unquestionably be far superior to any advantages for liberal culture which the majority of those who might avail themselves of it would otherwise be likely to receive.

To whatever objections, real or imaginary, the plan here proposed may be liable, it has at least some important advantages in addition to its evident availability and economy. One of these is to be found in the fact that young ladies might in this way successfully pursue a course of collegiate study without being so constantly removed from the practical culture and moral influences of home as to unfit them for the duties of life in the sphere to which they belong, and in which they are destined to move. It is probably one of the most serious objections to the continuous four-years' college or boarding-school course, that it elevates the ideal at the expense of the practical, or, perhaps, in some instances, sacrifices the practical without a corresponding advantage in any other direction. There are some who still believe that home is pre-eminently the sphere of woman, and that a continuous absence from home and home-duties and influences during the period when the character and habits are most rapidly forming, is not desirable, if its necessity could be avoided; and there are many who will subscribe to the opinion that the practical culture of home-life is that part of feminine education which is least of all to be neglected, in view of the prevailing tendencies of the day.

Another important advantage of the proposed method is, that it would at once give us the long acknowledged desideratum of enabling us to admit young ladies to our colleges for young men—to real colleges at least, and as ably and faithfully administered for one sex as for the other—without involving any of the insuperable objections to this measure which have generally been regarded as inseparable from it. Those interested in the education of young ladies have long been painfully conscious of the difference between the faculties of colleges and the instructors in boarding-schools, and between endowed institutions thoroughly equipped and conducted on principles of public utility, and the limited resources of private establishments operated in the interest of their proprietors. Such is in general the difference of educational facilities offered to young men and young women respectively. By the plan here proposed, young ladies could be admitted to endowed colleges ably officered, furnished with libraries and other needful educational apparatus, and at a season when the absence of the young men, besides removing an obvious and, as we believe, an insuperable objection to their admission, would afford them, as an additional advantage, the opportunity of pursuing a course of study especially adapted to their wants—which certainly can not be affirmed of the usual college curriculum. It is, in fact, an important point in favor of the plan we are considering, that young ladies need less intellectual discipline of the gymnastic order than is required in the course for young men. The object to be sought in their education is not so much the development of original intellectual power as the cultivation of intelligence and appreciation. These latter are the qualities in which woman is, by her natural mental constitution, calculated to excel. She can not generally excel in the former, at least not without a corresponding sacrifice in qualities more valuable to her.

Another consideration in favor of the proposed extension to young ladies, is the fact that such a measure would contribute materially to the financial prosperity of an institution, by largely increasing its revenues and patronage without a corresponding increase of expenditures.

For these reasons, and for others which can not be here stated, we believe, as we have already indicated, that the method explained in the former part of this paper for making college opportunities more generally accessible to young men, includes also the means of

extending to young ladies facilities for collegiate study better and more extensive than it is otherwise possible to give them. In this expression of our confidence, we would not, of course, suggest a comparison of what might thus be accomplished with an impossible ideal, but with what actually is and is likely to be. If we can not do all that we would, we should at least do all that we can; and it not unfrequently happens that what we can is better than what we would, as indicating the designs of a wisdom higher and farther-sighted than ours.

But to the minds of those who are conversant with the methods of the present college system, two objections to the plan above advocated will doubtless suggest themselves,—first, that the proposed vacations of two weeks each would not be sufficient for the instructors, who, by the usual arrangement, are accustomed to twelve weeks of vacation per year, instead of four; and, secondly, that the six or seven weeks of warm weather usually devoted to vacations would be necessarily included in the proposed terms of study for young ladies. Changes from the old system in these two respects are certainly involved in the plan here presented; and we are aware that there are some minds to whom custom is law and necessity, even the customs of one class when considered with reference to the different conditions and necessities of another. We propose to show, briefly, that neither of these two objections is valid—that, in fact, they owe whatever significance may attach to them to the force of tradition alone.

In the first place, the custom of allowing to college professors twelve weeks of vacation in the year in addition to the weekly holiday, making only two hundred instead of three hundred and thirteen working days in the year, is due not to their own necessities, but to those of the students. Young men and women from fifteen to twenty years old, the age at which their growth and development is most rapid, can not study safely, without considerable periods of intermission, as hard as they are obliged to study to make a profitable use of the time spent in college. But for their instructors, whose constitutions are already established, and who are engaged in their proper duties no more than half the time which the students are required to devote to theirs, the case is decidedly different. Their work is regular and not laborious, if they are familiar with the subjects they teach, and there is no reason, except in custom and the necessity of change

on the part of the students, why college professors should have twelve weeks of vacation per year, and a holiday every Saturday, while the minister, the farmer, the mechanic, the merchant, without the Saturday holidays, content themselves with a vacation of only four weeks, or more frequently with none at all.

Again: the custom of devoting six or eight weeks of the warmest weather to rest and recreation, is doubtless eminently agreeable not only to students and professors, but also to any other class who can afford to make such a use of their time. But vast majorities of our young men and women, such even as deserve to be educated, *can not* afford it. Shall all who can not, be excluded from the opportunity of liberal culture? Is education—shall it be—only for those who, even from childhood, are raised above the common necessities of life? These are the questions which we would address to the aristocrats of both learning and wealth—to those who imagine that customs which originated in the idea that learning and labor are necessarily antagonistic and irreconcilable, ought to be the perpetual conditions of educational privilege. It is an indisputable fact that a vast majority even of the capable and intelligent inhabitants of this country are obliged, by the circumstances of their condition, to labor on through the hot weather, on their farms, in their shops, in their homes. Especially do majorities of our industrious women have no vacation during the warm weather. The universal daily needs of civilized existence continue even through the dog-days, and must be supplied then as at any other time. It is only to those who can afford to live upon the labor of others that the indulgence of a vacation during the warm season is possible; and there are certainly thousands of intelligent and capable young men and women among the industrious middle classes whose aspirations we ought to respect, and whose necessities we ought not to despise. Now, if it be settled that there are those who ought to have the opportunities of liberal culture, who yet can not afford to be idle during the warm season, then we say that there is no business which can be more safely or profitably pursued at this period than study. It does not involve exposure to the heat either of the kitchen or the field; and the site of an institution of learning would naturally be so selected as to be cooler and more healthful in Summer than the homes of most of the students. Intellectual labor of the severest kind, and under the most

unfavorable circumstances, is actually continued during the warm weather in the newspaper-offices and counting-rooms of our great cities, and in a thousand other places and ways. We confess that we are unable to see any thing in the objections above stated, serious as they may at first seem, beyond the force of tradition or the possible surmises of captious imaginations. We believe that, upon consideration, they can really appear serious to no individual except in an inverse ratio to his interest in the result which our discussion contemplates.

It is to be remembered that we are not attempting to devise a scheme by which the sons and daughters of the wealthy may be educated in the manner the most convenient and comfortable both to themselves and their instructors. Our effort is rather in behalf of those to whom the present means and methods are either exceedingly inconvenient, or altogether impracticable; and our appeal is to those who are in sympathy with the aspirations of the capable and deserving young men and women of the middle and industrial classes, and who are willing to do faithful work in their behalf, who would place the means of liberal culture within their reach, even at the sacrifice of old traditions, or even at the cost of sharing something of the inconvenience of their situation. It is daily becoming more and more apparent that the attainment of a vastly higher and more general popular education, for both women and men, than is possible under the present system, is a matter of incalculable importance to every interest of religion and government and society in this country. It is certainly time that our colleges, a considerable portion of them at least, *should be administered in the interest of the people*; that the funds which have been wisely appropriated or generously bestowed, should be applied in such a manner as to secure the greatest good to the greatest numbers. And we leave it for the candid consideration of thoughtful minds to determine whether the plan of collegiate education which we have attempted to explain in this paper, is not adapted to the popular wants, and whether it does not include provision for a profitable and economical disposition both of the resources of institutions and of the time and talents of the students.

If the experiment proposed *could be fairly tried*, we believe there would be no reason to doubt its essential success, nor that in its success a most important feature would be added to our American

system of collegiate education. We believe that half the resources of money and talent now at the disposal of any one of a dozen of our prominent American colleges, would suffice to demonstrate the practicability of a vastly more popular collegiate culture. Thousands of young men to whom liberal education of any kind is now an impossibility would be able to support themselves at the institutions contemplated, by their own unaided industry. Thousands of young women would find the generous collegiate culture here proposed more accessible than even the flimsy mockeries with which so many are obliged to content themselves at present. And scores of American colleges, which are now calling loudly for additional funds wherewith to assist in the education of the sons and daughters of the wealthy, would be surprised to find how well the people could pay for their education under a system so contrived as not to cut them off from the sources of their wealth.

We trust, therefore, that the subject above presented may receive the careful consideration of both educators and people, whatever may be thought of our peculiar ideas in regard to it. We trust it may be considered in view not only of our present needs and the deficiencies of our present system, but also in the light of the possibilities and duties and responsibilities of our times ; for, if we can secure for the subject the earnest and thoughtful attention which its importance demands, we may confidently hope that the day is not far distant which shall bring us at least some practical solution of the problem of Collegiate Education for the People.

LITERARY NOTICES.

HOME LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

1.—*The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley, M. A., Founder of the Methodists.*

By Rev. L. TYERMAN, Author of the "Life and Times of Rev. S. Wesley, M. A., father of the Revs. F. and C. Wesley." In three volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1872. 8vo.

WE confess to have taken up these volumes with more than ordinary anticipations of pleasure; but before we read through the Introduction, we were both disappointed and disgusted. This Introduction is a defense of the proposition that Methodism is the greatest fact in the history of the Church of Christ—a proposition so palpably absurd that even Mr. Tyerman's valuable array of statistics can not bring it within the possibilities of historic respectability. Evidently, the author thought the following summary ought to be quite conclusive:

"Let the reader think of twelve millions of people at present enjoying the benefits of Methodist instruction; let him think of Methodism's twenty-one thousand eight hundred and seventy-five ordained ministers, and of its tens of thousand lay preachers; let him think of the immense amount of its Church property, and of the well-nigh countless number of its Church publications; let him think of millions of young people in its schools, and of its missionary agents almost all the wide world over; let him think of its incalculable influence upon other Churches, and of the unsectarian institutions to which it has given rise,—and then let him say whether the bold suggestion already made is not strictly true; namely, *that Methodism is the greatest fact in the history of the Church of Christ.*

"Here we have an immensely ramified Church organization, every-where preaching the same momentous doctrines and aiming at the same great purpose. A day never passes without numbers of its converts being admitted into heaven, and without many a poor, wayward wanderer being brought by it into the fold of Christ on earth. Thousands of its temples are daily open, and 'prayer' by its Churches, in one quarter of the globe or in another, is 'made continually.' It has belted the entire planet with its myriad agents, who, in English, French, Dutch, German, and Italian, in the various dialects and tongues of Africa, India, and China, and in the newly formed languages of the Fiji and the Friendly Islands, are calling to the nations, 'Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters; and he that hath no money, come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk, without money and without price.'

Of course such facts as these are overwhelming; and then some of them are facts far beyond the possibility of denial. If "a day never passes without numbers of its converts being admitted into heaven," it is certain that Methodism is something for which we may all be thankful.

It is difficult to treat such statements as Mr. Tyerman seems to delight in making, with any thing like the gravity which ought to characterize a notice of the life of such a man as John Wesley. The fact is, many of the statistics of Methodism are not altogether trustworthy. We think it can be shown, without much difficulty, that the number of communicants is largely overestimated. It is readily conceded that Methodism is a great religious power; that its polity is such as gives it immense influence in propagating its principles, and that, when compared with other Protestant denominations, its adherents are quite numerous. Still it is not the greatest fact in the history of the Church of Christ, nor is its influence so great as some enthusiastic Methodists would have us believe.

But Methodism as we have it to-day is a very different thing from what it was as founded by John Wesley. Wesley's movement was a reaction from the antinomianism which at that time so generally prevailed. Under the influence of Calvin's teaching, religious life had lost vitality. The idea of Divine Sovereignty had almost entirely destroyed human responsibility. In the English Church, where the influence of Calvin's doctrine was not so great, a cold, formal spirit had taken possession of the Churches, and there was little or nothing accomplished in converting the world. Wesley felt the need of a forward movement. His effort was to break down formality, and systematize work. Hence, he was to the English Church, in some respects, what Ignatius Loyola was to the Catholic. He organized labor, and made the power of association felt in the propagation of his cause. Hence, the rise and progress of Methodism furnish an illustration of a very important fact that must be recognized in any successful religious movement. Mr. Tyerman has given us a very minute history of the beginning of Methodism, as well as furnished us with an outline of its present status. And were it not for an occasional extravagance in its style, his work would be a valuable contribution to historic literature. But, we are sorry to say, his partisan interest in the Methodist Church is so excessive, that he often taxes our credulity to such a degree as to cause us to doubt, where it is quite possible he is correct.

Had we space we would like to make copious extracts, both as relates to John Wesley himself and the society which he organized. The following will serve to indicate that it was from the Moravians that Wesley learned some of the most prominent features of his religious movement:

"Wesley had been brought into strange communion with Moravians in his voyage to Georgia. At Savannah he had met with Spangenberg. On his return to London,

he found Böhler, and was induced to become a member of the first Moravian Society, founded at Fetter Lane. The rules of that Society are before us, entitled 'Orders of a Religious Society, meeting in Fetter Lane; in obedience to the command of God by St. James, and by the advice of Peter Böhler, May 1, 1738.' These rules provide for a meeting of the members once a week, to confess their faults, one to another, and to pray for one another, that they may be healed. A month later, it was agreed that the persons thus meeting in society should be divided into bands of not fewer than five or more than ten; and that some one in each band should be desired to interrogate the rest, and should be called the leader. Each band was to meet twice a week; every person was to come punctually at the hour appointed; every meeting was to begin and end with singing and prayer; and all the bands were to have a conference every Wednesday night. Any person absenting himself from his band-meeting without some extraordinary reason, was to be first privately admonished, and if he were absent a second time, to be reproved before the whole Society. Any member desiring or designing to take a journey was first to have, if possible, the approbation of the bands; and all who were in clubs were requested to withdraw their names from such associations. Any one desiring to be admitted was to be asked his reasons for this, and whether he would be entirely open, using no kind of reserve, least of all in the case of love or courtship. Every fourth Saturday was to be observed as a day of general intercession from twelve to two, from three to five, and from six to eight o'clock; and on one Sunday in every month a general love-feast was to be held from seven till ten at night. In order to a continual intercession, every member was to choose some hour, either of the day or night, to spend in prayer, chiefly for his brethren; and, in order to a continual fast, three of the members were to fast every day, Sundays and holidays excepted, and spend as much of the day as possible in retirement from business and in prayer. Each person was to pay to the leader of his band, at least once a month, what he could afford toward the general expenses; and any person not conforming to the rules of the Society, after being thrice admonished, was to be expelled."

Considerable space of the second volume is taken up in discussing Mr. Wesley's domestic relations. The whole story of Grace Murray's flirtations is for the first time told. We doubt the propriety of such revelations; but since we have them, it is evident that Mr. Wesley was not an adept in love affairs. It is certain that the fickle-minded Grace was able to make him accede to almost any thing to suit her caprices. This affair came near making an irreparable breach between him and his brother Charles. At this time Wesley was forty-six years of age; and in about two years afterward he was married to Mrs. Vazeille. This marriage proved to be a very ill-advised affair. It was suddenly arranged, the courtship not continuing more than twenty days. It is a very fine illustration of the old adage—"marry in haste and repent at leisure."

With all its defects, this work of Mr. Tyerman will be extensively read. It is by far the fullest and most satisfactory Life of Wesley that has yet appeared. The author has evidently intended to be faithful with the facts in his possession, and it can not be denied that he has not spared Mr. Wesley where censure seemed to be necessary. Hence, notwithstanding his exaggerations concerning Methodism as a system, his work will not likely be very acceptable to Methodists, on account of his exposure of the defects of Mr. Wesley's character. To the general reader it will be valuable because it is copious in details where other lives of Wesley are very meager.

- 2.—*The Life of Abraham Lincoln; from his Birth to his Inauguration as President.* By WARD H. LAMON. With Illustrations. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co., late Ticknor & Fields, and Fields, Osgood & Co. 1872. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 8vo. pp. 547.

ONE of the most difficult things to do, in a literary way, is to write a good biography. Hence, for the most part, works of this sort are failures. The reason of this is very obvious. Such works are generally written by some person excessively partial to the subject, and the result is, a biography made up of stale platitudes, whose chief recommendation is, that they are so glaringly absurd as to make it next to impossible for any one to be deceived by them. On the other hand, biographies are sometimes written by men unfriendly to the subjects, and in this case, the defects of character are magnified while virtues are almost entirely overlooked.

It is seldom, indeed, that we have an impartial biography of any one whose life is worth writing about. Hence it is refreshing, in these degenerate days, to meet with a work that at least professes to be a truthful history of one of America's most distinguished men. And this is all the more grateful because wholly unexpected. It was scarcely to be supposed that such a work as Lamon's "*Life of Abraham Lincoln*" would have been written so early after Mr. Lincoln's tragic death.

Of Colonel Lamon's opportunities and purposes in writing the *Life of Mr. Lincoln*, the following extract from the preface will assist to inform the reader:

"Early in 1869, Mr. Herndon placed at my disposal his remarkable collection of materials—the richest, rarest, and fullest collection it was possible to conceive. Along with them came an offer of hearty co-operation, of which I have availed myself so extensively that no art of mine would serve to conceal it. Added to my own collections, these acquisitions have enabled me to do what could not have been done before,—prepare an authentic biography of Mr. Lincoln.

"Mr. Herndon had been the partner in business and the intimate personal associate of Mr. Lincoln for something like a quarter of a century; and Mr. Lincoln had lived familiarly with several members of his family long before their individual acquaintance began. New Salem, Springfield, the old judicial circuit, the habits and friends of Mr. Lincoln, were as well known to Mr. Herndon as to himself. With these advantages, and from the numberless facts and hints which had dropped from Mr. Lincoln during the confidential intercourse of an ordinary life-time, Mr. Herndon was able to institute a thorough system of inquiry for every noteworthy circumstance and every incident of value in Mr. Lincoln's career.

"The fruits of Mr. Herndon's labors are garnered in three enormous volumes of original manuscripts, and a mass of unarranged letters and papers. They comprise the recollections of Mr. Lincoln's nearest friends; of the surviving members of his family and his family connections; of the men still living who knew him and his parents in Kentucky; of his school-fellows, neighbors, and acquaintances in Indiana; of the better part of the whole population of New Salem; of his associates and relatives at Springfield; and of lawyers, judges, politicians, and statesmen every-where, who had any thing of interest or moment to relate. They were collected at vast expense of time, labor, and money, involving the employment of many agents, long journeys, tedious examinations, and voluminous

correspondence. Upon the value of these materials it would be impossible to place an estimate. That I have used them conscientiously and justly, is the only merit to which I lay claim."

We are not disposed to question Colonel Lamon's conscientiousness in the discharge of the difficult task he undertook. We think it would be difficult to read the volume he has produced without concluding that he is largely entitled to the claim which he makes for himself. Still it can not be denied that he has used some facts in a way which, to say the least, is of very questionable propriety. It seems to us altogether out of place to drag into public view so many disagreeable family affairs. It is certainly in bad taste to make public property of some of the most delicate matters connected with Mr. Lincoln's life—matters that he himself would have hesitated to communicate to his most intimate friends.

It is, however, quite certain that this volume will work a revolution in public sentiment concerning its subject. Some of the points in which it differs from the heretofore generally received estimate of Mr. Lincoln's character are as follows: 1. It makes Mr. Lincoln an excessively coarse man; 2. A very ambitious man; 3. A crafty designing politician; 4. An infidel.

It recognizes his intelligence, benevolence, and honesty, and does him ample justice in all these respects. In regard to the infidelity of the martyred President, Colonel Lamon is very positive. But we notice a number of reviewers are greatly exercised concerning this matter, and are evidently unwilling to let this impression pass into history unchallenged. Now, it is certainly very well for the truth of history to have this question set at rest; but we do not know for any other reason that it is of the slightest consequence whatever. It is not long since the critics had quite a fight over the religious status of Charles Dickens. We think, however, that all such controversies are quite profitless, since it must be evident that men whose religious record is so obscure as to make such controversies possible, may reasonably be counted as irreligious men, and dismissed at once from the special guardianship of those who are "contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints."

Colonel Lamon's style is as simple as it is energetic and perspicuous. He tells his story with consummate skill, and it can not be denied that he has written a volume that will take a front rank in the literature of its kind.

3.—*Humanity Immortal*; or, Man Tried, Fallen, and Redeemed. By LAURENS P. HICKOK, D. D., LL. D. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard & Dillingham. 1872. Cincinnati: J. Holbrook. 8vo. pp. 362.

THE author of this volume is a profound thinker,—and while not always correct in his conclusions, is certainly never stupid. You can read

him on any subject upon which he may write, and be interested and profited, though you may differ from him *in toto cælo*.

The present work is not equal to "Creator and Creation" in profound reasoning, nor is it so interesting to the theological student; and yet it is more valuable to the general reader, and is likely to be more generally read. Chapter first treats of the primitive trial of humanity, and contains much that is well written and highly suggestive; chapter second treats of the preparation of humanity for the advent of the Redeemer, and is confined chiefly to a history of the Jews as developing the special providence of God; chapter third introduces us to the Incarnation; and chapter fourth to the work of the Holy Spirit in redemption. Under the Spirit's work in regeneration we have the following, which conclusively shows that the old Augustinian theory has yet some distinguished adherents:

"The power of the Holy Ghost—on such as he sees reason effectually to operate—here comes in, in concurrence with all else which, without him, is ineffectual. Face to face with the human spirit, he works directly on mind in his own distinct and peculiar way, which, so far as our insight into all revealing can go, we have before described, and wakes the life and intensifies the energy of every faculty. Memory is quickened to call up anew past sins and mercies and persistent neglect and ingratitude, and the soul can not shut down its convictions of guilt and desert. Self-reproach and conscious claim and short opportunity lay their burdens upon the spirit, which the soul can neither put down nor carry along. Old sense-indulgences cease to please, and from no quarter comes any peace to the troubled heart. In this arrest and suspension of all joy, the Holy Spirit further 'takes the things of Christ, and shows them' to the soul whose mental eye is now opened to see the suffering and mercy, and waiting wish to receive, and longing interest to save; and to this power of the Cross he additionally works with his own direct power, which knows the chords to touch, and how intensely to make them vibrate; and so, in this 'day of his power,' that mind becomes 'willing,' and the human spirit now as freely disposes itself toward God as it before did toward self-gratification. Old idols are discarded; a new master is taken; 'the old man is put off,' and 'the new man is put on,' which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness."

Chapter fifth discusses the last things in the redemption of humanity; such as, Death; the Intermediate State; the Resurrection; Final Judgment; and the End of the Mediatorial Reign.

We conclude with the following concerning the immortality of the spirit:

"The Divine inspiration sending life into the nostrils of the first man, sent, moreover, a rational spirit in the Maker's image along with it. The living soul which man thus became was other than the sentient nature of the brute. The sense became imbued with spirit, and while the spirit's own abode was in its retained ethereal forces, it also infused its agency through the animal sense, making this to be persistent human soul, the tabernacle for which was the substantial material forces that was the basis of the animal body. There is thus the occasion for comprehending the Scripture analysis of man's whole being. The ethereal forces, held as the pure temples of the spirit, constitute Paul's *pneumatikon*, translated 'spiritual body;' and the working of the spirit through the sentient soul, and holding permanently about the soul the material basis of the animal structure, constitutes Paul's *psuchikon*, translated less discriminatingly, in the same texts, 'natural body.' The first is the body of the *pneuma*; the second is the body of the *psuche*; and then over and beside this is the *choikos*, as the 'earthy,' and which is the mere animal nature that perishes. The *pneumatikon* is the minor penetralium of ethereal forces which the spirit

directly controls and uses; the *psuchikon* is the permanently held material forces which the sentient soul occupies, and on which the changing elements of the bodily members gather and dissolve; and so, linked by the spirit, the soul and soul-body are made coexistent and immortal with the spirit and the spirit-body.

"But this soul and spirit, *psuche* and *pneuma*, each of which the man has, but neither of which the brute has, and which during probation have been in living connection, are now, in the closing of probation, to be sundered; and in this separation of soul and spirit beyond the dissolving of the animal body, is the peculiarity of human death."

4.—*In Christ*; or, The Believer's Union with his Lord. By A. J. GORDON, Pastor of the Clarendon-street Church, Boston. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1872. Cincinnati: George E. Stevens & Co. 16mo. pp. 209.

THIS little volume discusses: 1. The phrase "In Christ;" 2. "Crucifixion in Christ;" 3. "Resurrection in Christ;" 4. "Baptism into Christ;" 5. "Life in Christ;" 6. "Standing in Christ;" 7. "Prayer in Christ;" 8. "Communion in Christ;" 9. "Sanctification in Christ;" 10. "Glorification in Christ."

While discussing the subject of "Baptism into Christ," the author gives us the following significant passage:

"Here is first the *burial*, which confirms and seals our crucifixion in Christ. The Spirit declares, '*The body is dead because of sin*,' and the water opens now its mystic tomb to ratify that verdict, and how, as for a moment the prostrate form of the disciple disappears beneath the wave, is the whole solemn story of our death in Christ silently rehearsed! Here is no sparing or reprieving of our guilty nature. The inexorable purpose for which '*our old man was crucified with Him*,' is proclaimed without equivocation, '*that the body of sin might be destroyed*.' Judaism, that trial of man in the flesh, that system for his cleansing in his carnal state, had as its ordinance, circumcision, the typical rite of the *purification of the flesh*. But Christianity, starting upon the axiom that 'the carnal mind is enmity against God,' and that 'they that are in the flesh can not please God,' has a far different ordinance, even baptism, the typical rite of the *burial of the flesh*, in order to a better resurrection. Circumcision is 'the putting away of the filth of the flesh;' baptism is the 'putting off of the body of the sins of the flesh.' Therefore by this confession do we not only, as Edward Irving expresses it, 'sign the death-warrant of our natural man which has been issued from the court of heaven,' but we sign it literally with the '*sign of the cross*;' the similitude of our Lord's death being the appointed and permanent vehicle of this confession, that so we may be constantly reminded not only that we must die to sin in order to live to God, but, except we die *with Him*, we can not live with Him.

"And can those who realize the greatness of those two dangers which are always threatening the Church—namely, a bloodless moralism on the one hand and a spiritless ceremonialism on the other—be too grateful for the *form* of this ordinance which the Spirit has thus fixed? Substitute, as has been done, the sprinkling or pouring of water upon the person for burial in the water; thus let the *cleansing* only of the soul be signified in the rite, with no symbolic designation of the method of that cleansing, death in Christ. It is easy for the moralist now to use the ordinance without ever having his mind turned to the sacrifice of Calvary. Ay, desiring not to see that sacrifice which means death to the carnal man, he comes readily to view the rite as a kind of Christian circumcision, marking the sanctifying of human nature, and bringing that into covenant with God. And so 'as many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh' will readily be constrained to adopt it, when both their heart and their flesh would cry out against that baptism into Christ's death which marks the crucifying and putting off of the old man. And, on the other hand, how easily the

idea of mystical efficacy becomes attached to the element of water, unless the form of its use be such as to carry the thought immediately and certainly to Christ crucified and dead! How vitally important, then, that 'form of doctrine' prescribed by the Scriptures, namely, the sacramental burial, which, while it so distinctly signifies our union with Him 'who came by water,' as distinctly adds the saving clause, '*not by water only, but by water and blood!*'"

Mr. Gordon is one of the most distinguished preachers in the Baptist Church, but we think it will scarcely be doubted that many of the positions of his book are more in harmony with the views of Disciples than with the views of a majority of his own denomination. That he is able to write such things as he has, without being charged with "Campbellism," is one of the evidences that the world moves, and that the days of religious proscription are past. We heartily commend his volume to all who would more fully understand that wonderful relationship which is suggested by the phrase "In Christ."

-
- 5.—*Within and Without*. By GEORGE MAC DONALD, LL. D., Author of "Wilfred Cumbermede," "Annals of a Quiet Neighborhood," etc. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., successors to Charles Scribner & Co. 1872. Cincinnati: George E. Stevens & Co. 16mo. pp. 219.

It can not be denied that the author of this volume has some of the qualities of a first-class poet, but it is a pity that he writes upon religious subjects. "Within and Without" is a poem of considerable power, but it is often irreverent and sometimes excessively foolish. The word "God" will be found upon nearly every page, while on many pages it is found five or six times. Some passages are exquisitely beautiful; but the poem as a whole, is defective in plot, for which there is very little compensation in its questionable theology.

-
- 6.—*Mediation, the Function of Thought*. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1871. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 16mo. pp. 213.

THIS volume forms a part of an unfinished work, and discusses the relation of Christ to the world. It is an effort to show that Christ and his apostles claimed the reasonableness of the doctrine which they preached, and as such appealed to the honest conviction of men for its acceptance. It is affirmed that there exists a base in the normal constitution of humanity for the doctrine of Mediation, and that this base is as wide and universal as the whole scope of human thought. The author then distinguishes the function of thought in man from all other animals, and shows that this is not only in degree but in kind. These specific functions are classed as, I. That of Language; II. Proportion, or the relation of forms, subdivided under three heads—Pure Mathematics, Applied Science, and Art. III. Jurisprudence or Law. In all which man is not only superior, but essentially different from all the animals. By language he has general ideas,

society; through proportion, he has form, beauty, art, mathematics; from law, order, government, morals.

The work is unquestionably one of considerable ability; and as it belongs to a class of books that are just now especially needed, it ought to command very general attention.

-
- 7.—*May Christians go to War?* A Debate between THOMAS MUNNELL and J. S. SWEENEY. Cincinnati: Bosworth, Chase & Hall. 12mo. 1872. pp. 247.

IT can not be denied that this volume discusses a very important question; and as each side is presented by a man of acknowledged ability, the discussion ought to be of very considerable value. We do not suppose that such a question as is here discussed can ever be settled by logic. War is not the result of reason, but of passion; and when passion is highly excited, men do not stop to ask the question whether it is right or wrong to engage in war, but they act from other considerations altogether. Still we think a work like this may do some good, and we therefore commend it to all who are interested in the question which it discusses.

-
- 8.—*Mountaineering in the Sierra Nevada.* By CLARENCE KING. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co., late Ticknor & Fields, and Fields, Osgood & Co. 1872. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 8vo. pp. 292.

THOSE who are fond of wild, romantic scenery, and who have a steady nerve while making the somewhat hazardous ascents of worse than Alpine mountains, can not fail to be interested in this volume. The style is fresh and vigorous, and as the writer has experimented in comparatively a new field, his book is much more entertaining and valuable than works of this kind usually are.

-
- 9.—*The History of Greece.* By Professor Dr. ERNST CURTIUS. Translated by ADOLPHUS WILLIAM WOOD, M. A. Revised after the last German edition, with an Index, by W. A. PACKARD, Ph. D. Vol. III. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: George E. Stevens & Co. 12mo. royal. pp. 592.

THIS volume introduces us to one of the most interesting chapters in Grecian history—that which relates to the Peloponnesian war. In treating this subject, Professor Curtius shows himself a master in the work he has undertaken. In no part of his "History of Greece" has he given stronger evidence of impartiality, comprehensiveness, and judicial fitness as a historian. He generalizes the important facts with such apparent ease, and writes, withal, in such an entertaining style, that he has given to a somewhat worn-out subject a new and fresh interest.

- 10.—*Communings in the Sanctuary.* By R. RICHARDSON. Lexington, Ky.: Transylvania Printing and Publishing Company. 1872. 16mo. pp. 179.

THIS volume is full of the good things of the kingdom. It is written in a devotional spirit, and avoids all doctrinal controversy. It is not, however, made up of pious platitudes. It deals with some of the most important problems of the divine life; and as the style is graceful and perspicuous, the reading is always pleasant and instructive. We hope this little volume will find its way into every Christian household, where it ought to be both a "thing of beauty and a joy forever."

- 11.—*The Teacher, The Class, and The Book.* A Series of fifty-two Sunday-school Lessons, arranged from the Gospels consolidated, and with reference to the nine Historical Periods of the New Testament. By WARREN B. HENDRYX, Author of "Analytic and Synthetic Bible Lessons." Vol. I. Cincinnati: Bosworth, Chase & Hall. 1872. 16mo. pp. 190.

UNLESS we are greatly mistaken, this book will be of considerable service to Sunday-school teachers; for it is not only original in many of its features, but presents old methods in such a lucid, concise style, as to make it in all respects worthy of the highest praise. Those who have been laboring between the many foolish Sunday-school manuals and no helps of any kind, will find this little volume a very useful assistant. We are sorry to see that the author thinks Mark wrote from Rome *under the direction of Peter*.

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 1.—*Le Concile du Vatican; son histoire, et ses conséquences politiques et religieuses.* Par E. DE PRESSENSÉ. (The Vatican Council; its history and its political and religious consequences. By E. DE PRESSENSÉ.) Paris: Sandoz & Fischbacher. 1872. 12mo. pp. 526.

THIS volume is an important addition to the already large literature called forth by the Vatican Council; and we may rest assured "the end is not yet." This great event is of a character profoundly to move the spirit of our age, and to excite, in a lively manner, the best thinkers in the religious and political world to the study of its history and consequences. This Council came forth as the birth of a political and religious world-crisis, and is itself, in this double character, a great crisis. The character and present condition of the Catholic Church on the one hand, and of the political and social condition of the Christian world on the other, made the decisive

conflict between Rome and the enlightened world, of which this Council, with its immediate prominent, essential accompaniments, was the culminating point, inevitable.

The great spirit of this age, in its immense progress in evangelical and political and scientific freedom, with thundering imperious voice, summoned Rome to surrender her most cherished elements of power. But these were characteristic and essential to her very being, her life, her greatness, and glory; they had made her history. To surrender these, would be to pass, by her own mouth, terrible condemnation on herself, and, stripped of her imperial claims, crushed, humbled, and dishonored before all the world, to abdicate her throne. Roman Catholicism, which means the Papacy, chose the other alternative,—to startle the world by contradicting and denouncing in the clearest and boldest and extremest statements, as in the *Syllabus*, the most cherished doctrines of the age, by reasserting, in undiminished completeness, all its pretensions in the past centuries, and, instead of yielding and retreating, advancing, with bold defiant front, to the utmost extreme of human pretension, in due dogmatic form, claiming for a man, for the Pope, the awful attribute of God, infallibility—a pretension from the dreadful impiety of which even the Hildebrands of the darkest periods of Papal unlimited dominion shrunk back terrified. This is what this Council, with its antecedents, signifies. Thus Rome, in this last supreme act, has defied the world of light and freedom, of prodigious power, to mortal combat. *All* must yield; religion, social life, science, governments as they are to-day in their highest achievements of light and freedom, must yield before Rome, or enter upon fierce, deadly, eternal war.

In vain the remonstrances of so many eminent men in her own bosom. Her destiny, fixed in her determined character, pushed her on to this last extreme act, and will hasten her, inevitably, to all the consequences of it. The hopes that had been and are yet entertained by many noble hearts in the Catholic Church, often shared by Protestants, and, in a certain manner, expressed by our author in his book—of progress and reform in the Church of Rome—are not legitimate; they can never be realized.

The conflict, as defined by Rome itself with masterly precision, involves all that the enlightened world to-day cherishes. Study carefully the *Syllabus* and the decisions of the Council, with the Pope's utterances, and see if this be not so. So the world well understands it. No wonder, then, the profoundest minds in the Catholic Church, in the Protestant Church, and outside of these, are stirred to thought and action, and the press is prolific with the results.

De Pressensé is well fitted for the task he has here undertaken. All the questions involved—religious, scientific, social, and political—have been objects of mature study with him. He has, from his position in the midst of the Roman world, right where has been one of the centers of its chief

power and glory, and of its chief conflicts with evangelical Christianity, been led to study profoundly Catholicism in its doctrines, in its past and present history, of which his numerous published works, and his articles in the *Revue Chrétienne*, give full proof.

Of this present book the author says, in the Preface:

"To understand the character of this book, it is indispensable to give its history; for, by the necessity of circumstances, it was written at two quite different epochs. I had gone to Rome, about the end of the year 1869, to complete my labors on the Primitive Church, by studying the wonderful discoveries of the Chevalier de Rossi in the Catacombs. I was present at the opening of the Council—at its stormy debates, whose echoes resounded even beyond the arches of Saint Peter. I met several of the most eminent bishops, both of the majority and of the minority. Full of this great event, since my return to Paris, I made it the subject of several lectures, and of articles in the *Revue des Deux-Mondes* and the *Revue Chrétienne*, surrounding myself with all the documents which could confirm what I had seen with my own eyes. From this labor resulted the first part of this book, which contains the history of the Council to the proclamation of the new dogma. It was not only finished, but ready to appear, when the terrible war of 1870 broke out. We all left our begun labors, and hastened to what was more pressing. Ambulance-life with the armies, and then at Paris, absorbed all my attention, and the time which was left had to be devoted to restore the public mind by efforts more energetic than efficacious. I did not take up my book until the end of the session of the Legislature gave me some leisure. I could not change any thing in the first part; it bears its date. Some of the men of whom I there spoke as living, are now dead; but that which more than all is dead, is the hope there expressed of seeing the opposition of our Gallican bishops result in one of those holy resistances which prepare reforms. Nevertheless, their protestation preserves all its value; it is not my fault if they have flagrantly charged themselves with falsehood. I have attempted to present, in its true character, the movement of the Old Catholics in Germany. Finally, I have sought, as a conclusion to this history of the Council, to separate the true idea of religious authority from all that changes and corrupts it. This is the subject of the second part of my book, which, on more than one point, corrects the illusions of the first."

Our author, in describing the three "fractions" of Catholicism in France, gives us some brief portraits of prominent men in each. These three fractions are "absolutist ultramontanism, liberal ultramontanism, and Gallicanism in its various shades, more or less distinctly colored." The first fraction is well defined and well known, represented by its leading journals, the *Univers* and *Monde*. The second is represented by such men as Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans, Montalembert, and others. The third class has many eminent representatives. Among the noblest characters of the more enlightened and liberal class of the French Catholic clergy, de Pressensé names Darboy, Archbishop of Paris, who was murdered by the Commune. Of this prelate he says:

"Monseigneur Darboy belongs to the most learned and enlightened of the living clergy. His fine and expressive form bears the seal of distinction and austerity. His piety is full of vigor, and nothing is more touching than his addresses. He has a horror of ultramontane exaggerations. He passionately loves France and its greatness, and mourns over the absurdities which compromise the future of religion and the modern mind. . . . He has had much to suffer from suspicions of which he was the object on the part of the zealots; every one knows that he was but ill tolerated at Rome. His personal distinction

and his eloquence dissipate all prejudice when he can plead his own cause before the Pope ; but the voices that accuse him get the better of him as soon as he is gone.

"The Archbishop of Paris has brought to the capital, or at least has allowed to grow up around him, an entire body of educated, enlightened, liberal young clergy, that would bring bright days to the Church of France, if the opposing current were not so strong, and always favored by the highest ecclesiastical authority.

"The boldest step of the Archbishop of Paris was his bringing into the pulpit of Notre-Dame Père Hyacinthe, on whom truly has fallen the mantle of Lacordaire, and who brought back to the arches of the great basilica the best days of religious eloquence." (Pages 103-4.)

A fact in the final passage of the *schema* of the dogma of infallibility is stated by our author, worth noting, and that is altogether characteristic and worthy of the Roman Curia. It seems that the formula, or *schema*, was quietly and secretly changed in a very essential manner, altogether unknown to the opposing minority, a new clause having been surreptitiously inserted after its first reading, and for the final vote and proclamation :

"There was no new discussion until the 18th of July, the day of the solemn proclamation. What was not the astonishment of the Fathers of the minority, when there was presented for the final vote a new formula, singularly aggravated in the ultramontane sense ! In fact, the original text, read on the 13th of July, was as follows : 'The definitions (decisions) of the Roman Pontiff are unchangeable of themselves.' The final formula was thus modified : 'The decisions of the Roman Pontiff are unchangeable of themselves, and not by reason of the consent of the Church (—ex sese, non autem consensu ecclesiæ).' We could never have believed such a subterfuge possible, which would be considered monstrous in any honorable parliament, had the fact not been attested by Dr. Friedrich in his letter of justification to the Archbishop of Munich. In this he says : 'In the decree on the infallibility is the interpolation, not discussed by the Council, *non autem ex consensu ecclesiæ*, which the majority interpolated between the last General Congregation of the 13th of July, and the public session of the 18th of the same month. You, however, my Lord, had returned to Munich without knowing this circumstance, and you asked the man, so respected by the whole world, on whom, as well as on myself, you have laid the major excommunication—the Canon Döllinger—to give you explanations on this subject.'" (Page 316.)

We have space only to add two more passages, showing the outraged feelings, and the bold spirit of remonstrance, on the part of the nobler minds in the Catholic Church, against the shameless frauds and the arrogant pretensions of the Roman Curia.

In denouncing the outrageous frauds committed by the menials of the Papacy, in corrupting historical documents by erasures, interpolations, and other fraudulent changes, the French Abbé de Gratry says :

"This system of apologetics without frankness is one of the causes of our religious decadence for centuries. From the moment that mankind perceives the least trace of ruse or duplicity in the apostle, it turns away and flees from him,—the best flee farther than any others. The spirits of men listen not to the voice of liars. What are we, then—we, Catholic priests, ministers of Jesus Christ and of his Gospel, and servants of his Church ? Are we the preachers of falsehood or the apostles of the truth ? Is it so, then, that all truth, every true result, every historic and real fact, is not for us, as every lie is against us ? Has not the time come to reject with disgust the frauds, the interpolations, and the mutilations which the liars and forgers, our most cruel enemies, have managed to introduce among us ? For a long time I could not believe in the possibility of a defense based on ignorance, blindness, and half-sincerity, or even bad faith, that aims at our end, that believes in the

goodness and truth of the end, but that, in order to reach this end, has recourse to ruse, to mystery, to force, to lying, to the forging of false documents? Once more—has God need of these frauds?" (Pages 291-2.)

Of this passage de Pressensé has well said, that "it will take its place by the side of Pascal's 'Provincial Letters' for all honest minds; it is pure, free air in place of the vitiated atmosphere of incense and villainy which pervades the sanctuaries of Jesuitism."

The other passage is the conclusion of Dr. Friedrich's letter to the Archbishop of Munich, already cited above:

"To conclude,—one more assurance, my Lord. Let all the world bend before your 'infinitely superior jurisdiction;' for myself, I will not do it, to become unfaithful to truth.

"As certainly as I am not mistaken on this point, so certainly am I not mistaken when I say that the Roman Council will surely, sooner or later, be seen in all its nullity. The pastoral letters of the bishops, who now deny what they before said and wrote, can not long sustain it. In the Church, too, for a while, 'force may crush the right;'* but in the end, right and truth will have the victory. He who fights for the right and the truth, fights for God."

2.—*La Mission des Femmes en temps de Guerre.* Par Madame WILLIAM MONOD. (The Mission of Women in time of War. By Madame WILLIAM MONOD.) Paris: Ch. Meyrnis. 1871. 12mo. pp. 320.

La Femme. Deux Discours. Par ADOLPH MONOD. (Woman. Two Sermons. By ADOLPH MONOD.) Paris: Ch. Meyrnis. 1871. 12mo. pp. 120.

BOTH these books have come forth from the bosom of the same noble family, the Monods, so full of noble names and memories, so honored in the French Protestantism of our day.

The subject of Madame Monod's book is certainly one of extraordinary interest; it is the mission of women in times of war; the presence and blessed work of the angel of love and mercy in the midst of the scenes of carnage, of inhumanity, of horrors indescribable, that the hand of *man* has wrought; the terrible instrument, too often, of the wicked ambitions of the rulers of the earth.

In the Preface, written by Dr. Appia, of Geneva, the object of the book is stated:

"The following work, written in time of peace, was inspired by the desire of exciting in the hearts of women a serious and effective interest in favor of the victims of war. The reading of recent writings on the care to be given to the wounded, awakened in the author a lively sympathy for this class of sufferers, and inspired her with the desire of communicating to other women the same sentiments. What woman, indeed, can remain insensible at reading what women have done in relieving the sufferings of war, pushing their work even to the field of battle itself?"

It is woman's work, especially, to relieve suffering.

"In reading the following chapters," says Dr. Appia, "man can not but feel a certain humiliation; for his chief work in war is to strike, while woman hastens to bind up the wounds which man has made, and often succeeds in curing them.

*The favorite *dictum* of Bismarck.

"Woman has, more than man, the gift of devotion and sympathy; her peculiar aptitudes make it to her a duty not to remain inactive in the presence of such great evils.

"I know nothing more beautiful than the active and disinterested charity of woman. How sweet it is for a wounded sufferer to hear, after the noise of arms, a sympathetic voice; to behold, after scenes of horror, the compassionate face of a woman, and to find near his pillow, at the moment of death, an affection almost maternal!

"For my part, I thank the author of this work, that she has contributed to bring these things to our attention. Evil, it is said, is contagious; may it be even so with good! and we can not too much favor this contagion. According to the confession of military surgeons themselves, women are better fitted than men to take care of the wounded. It was well, also, I believe, that a woman has taken up the pen to encourage other women, by showing them bright examples to follow."

The book is very complete in its purpose, as its contents show: The Rôle of Women in Times of War; The Sufferings of an Army during a Campaign; Sister Martha, of Besançon, or International Charity at the Commencement of the Present Century; Miss Florence Nightingale, or Genius and Charity; American Women during the War of Slavery; The Women of the Grand Duchy of Baden; Madame Simon, the German Nightingale; History of a Military Hospital, etc.

Among the most interesting parts of the book are the brief but touching and instructive chapters recounting the labors of Sister Martha, of Besançon, Miss Nightingale, Madame Simon, and the brief notice of Mother Anne. It is beautiful to notice the same noble movements of Christian, human charity in the hearts of Catholics and Protestants. The names here represent France, England, and Germany; and none nobler in her life-long and most heroic, all-sacrificing devotion than Sister Martha, the simple, poor, French lay-sister of Besançon. How many good examples of the purest and most devoted charity are to be found in the history of the Catholic Church!

But of this noble woman a few words:

"Have you ever seen, in some window filled with pictures, the portrait of a woman of from sixty to seventy years of age, with a large intelligent forehead, an energetic, finely cut mouth, an eye bright with kindness, a physiognomy animated, attractive, sympathetic? All the features announce at once dignity, force, and sweetness; an air of happiness illuminates them; the whole expresses decision, firmness. This strong woman feels her strength. She is dressed in the plain garb of a nun. Many civil and military decorations adorn this feminine bust. At the bottom of the picture, you can read the brief and touching words pronounced one day in all simplicity, but since inseparable from this noble form, 'All the unfortunate are my friends.'"

She died at the advanced age of seventy-five, having devoted fifty-four years to a life of good work. Sister Martha was a heroine of the first rank, and in the highest sense. She died in 1823, famous over all Europe, and personally honored of emperors and kings.

One of the noblest women of our age is Madame Simon, a Saxon lady of Dresden, whose great activity, wonderful power of organization, splendid courage, and heroic endurance, displayed during the great German wars of

1866 and 1870, among the wounded of these campaigns, is one of the bright pages in the history of these wars, and of our period. We have elsewhere, from German sources, read her history. In the conclusion of the admirable sketch of her labors, Madame Monod says of her:

"Madame Simon did not suffer herself to be repelled by labors often dangerous, nor by the fatigues of a life without respite or repose. On her feet constantly, active, hurrying to and fro from morning to evening, from evening to morning, she scarcely found time to change her garments. For weeks she lived in an impested atmosphere, having before her eyes only scenes of horror. Accustomed to all the comforts of civilized life, she endured all the privations incident to a time of war, in a country ravaged, or in the midst of a hostile population. At one time she filled the humble functions of a servant with the devotion of a Sister of Charity; at another time you might see her commanding a transport, or reproving some negligent functionary with the authority of a superior officer. God blessed all her enterprises. Soon her co-operation and counsels were sought every-where; the attention she had excited was changed into veneration. She appeared in the hospitals of the country as an angel of mercy. Her name must be mentioned when the history of the sufferings of the wounded of Sadowa is related. Without Madame Simon, the picture of these memorable days would be incomplete."

And in the terrible war that followed between Germany and France, her wonderful activity was the same.

In the Schleswig-Holstein war, another woman's name became famous:

"Countess Anna von Stolberg-Wernigerode, superior of the house of Bethany, an establishment of Protestant deaconesses at Berlin. Her brother, Count Eberhard von Stolberg, directed the benevolent work of the Knights of St. John. This peaceful militia proposed to establish hospitals near the seat of war for the wounded, both of friends and enemies. This enterprise soon reached a wide extension, and obtained from the Government perfect liberty of action. Count Eberhard at once called his sister to his aid. 'You must be associated with us,' said he; 'the hands of our men are too rough and too impatient to give to the wounded the attentions they need.'

"*Mother Anne*, as she was called, set out at once with her brother, another member of the order of the Hospitalers of St. John, the Countess Eberhard, born a princess Reuss, and two deaconesses. Skillful surgeons were secured, and a hospital was established at Altona. Countess Anna and her companions exposed themselves to all the dangers of war, to consecrate day and night to the wounded. 'Mother Anne,' said some one to her, 'you don't understand the Danish, and yet there are among our wounded a great number of enemies.' 'Enemies?' replied she; 'this word is banished from the dictionary of charity; love understands and speaks all the languages of the earth.'

"Four years later, *Mother Anne* did prodigies of devotion in a country where famine and the typhus fever were making terrible ravages. Scarcely returned to Bethany, this disease, the seeds of which she brought home with her, obliged her to rest from her labors, and a few days later, this humble deaconess gave up her soul to God, peaceful and joyful, having given her life for the holiest of causes."

The two discourses of M. Monod are devoted to a discussion of the true sphere and work of woman, resting on the text: "And God said, It is not good for man to be alone; I will make him a help-meet for him." (Gen. ii, 18.) This is, in fact, the true text from which to start in this discussion, and the proper understanding of which gives the key to woman's true destiny and life. M. Monod has well accomplished his important task; it is a Scriptural, evangelical discussion, sensible and sober,

with full freedom of thought, and yet faithful to the Word of God. These discourses have been already translated and published in Germany, and there widely circulated by those who are truly and earnestly laboring for the proper instruction of woman for her great mission on earth. It is refreshing, in the midst of the wild extravagances of a fanatical, licentious, "woman's rights" advocacy, to meet with such books as these. How different, and how infinitely nobler and purer, is the spirit that breathes in these pages, from that which animates those hybrid creatures in the external form of woman whose passion and glory are not in works of love and mercy, but in denying their womanly nature, trying to be men, and in fiercely wrestling with men for the fields of masculine activity and prowess, with a feeling that seems to cry out at every moment, wildly, "I want to be a man!"

3.—*Das tausendjaehrige Reich. Wider die Gegner des schriftgemaessen Chiliasmus.* Von A. KOCH. Basel. (The Millennium. Against the opponents of the Scriptural Chiliasm. By A. KOCH. Bale.) 1872. 8vo. pp. 204.

WE confess to a good degree of hesitation and misgiving in opening a new book on the Millennium. Since the day those portions of the New Testament were written that speak of the second coming of Christ, of a resurrection of the dead, and especially the book of Revelation, the most diverse and extravagant interpretations have been indulged in, in every age, concerning these events. First of all, these interpreters were determined to read and write *prophecy* into exact, developed *history*, what can never be done, never was intended to be done, by the author of these revelations, and is altogether contrary to the very notion, the purpose, and character of Biblical prophecy. And yet, with an obstinacy and daring entirely uncontrollable, men have for two thousand years persisted in this resolute determination to change prophecy into actual history. How they have succeeded, the world very well knows. In the second place, another common characteristic of millenarianism has been, and it seems ever will be, to fix not only the geography and the exact character of these future events, as if it were of the past or the present, but to establish the precise dates of these events in the current chronology of our time record. How they have succeeded in this, is also quite familiar now to all the world.

Another most striking characteristic of this millenarianism is, the many extravagant and singularly absurd views set forth by its advocates throughout the whole of its history,—views often extremely carnal and sensuous, if not sensual. Finally, a strange fact characterizes the chiliastic interpreters—the extraordinary contradiction among themselves. All this makes us very cautious in opening a new volume on the Millennium. To all this there are noble exceptions.

And yet, can it be otherwise than that this great subject must ever engage, in a lively manner, the attention of Christian men? It is certainly a field of Biblical interpretation most attractive and edifying; but nowhere should men, even the greatest, be unpretendingly humble, cautious, and circumspect, nowhere keep themselves more within proper bounds and limits, remembering how easy it is to err in prophetic interpretations. The book before us presents, certainly, one of the most sober attempts in this dangerous field of interpretation we have yet met with; and we think it will be read by even the most decided anti-millenarians with attention and respect. It is a reply to opponents, yet it has the grace of being without passion—a rare virtue, especially in this strife!

In the very opening of his book, the author gives us a brief analysis of the great chiliastic passage in Rev. xx, 1-6, as follows:

"However obscure to us much may be in the Revelation of St. John, the current of thought in the section of chapter xix is clear to every simple reader of the Bible. After a preceding triumphal song of the heavenly inhabitants (chap. xix, 5-7), verses 11-21 treat of the return of Christ and the judgment of the beast, the false prophet, and their hosts; chap. xx, 1-6, of the thousand-years' reign and the destruction of the beast; verses 7-9, of the last attack upon this kingdom by Gog and Magog, after the end of the thousand years; verses 10-15, of the judgment of the devil and of men, which follows on the destruction of Gog and Magog, and coincides with the destruction of the world; finally, chap. xx, 1, to xxii, 5 (to which is attached the conclusion of the book, chap. xxii, 6-21), treats of the glory of the new world, that takes the place of the old.

"Antichrist has assembled the nations to a great campaign against the people of God. His hosts cover the holy land and the holy city of Jerusalem (comp. chap. xi, 1-13; xvi, 14 and 16; xvii, 14, with chap. xix, 19); on earth no salvation is to be found from his power. Then opens *heaven*, and the Lord Jesus, accompanied by myriads of his host, comes forth from the place where he had been hitherto concealed. With this visible interposition of God in the course of things, all is decided.

"The beast and the kings of the earth, it is true, are assembled for battle against Christ; but no actual conflict occurs, but they are brought to judgment. The Antichrist and the false prophet are seized by the strong, heavenly warriors, and thrown alive into the lake of fire, and their armies are slain. The devil, who gave them his power, is not yet destroyed forever, but is made harmless for a thousand years. And now, on the ruins of Antichrist's kingdom, the Lord erects his reign of glory on the earth. The martyrs who have fallen in the tribulation of Antichrist's reign, of which the Revelation so often speaks, and all they who have remained faithful during the period of temptation that had come over the whole earth, now live and reign with Christ a thousand years. This is the first resurrection.

"After the expiration of the thousand years, power is given once more to the devil to deceive the nations. A revolt against the reign of Christ takes place; the heathen take counsel against God and his anointed, saying: 'Let us tear their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us!' But their raging is in vain. Only a besieging, not a destruction, of the center of the kingdom of God is allowed them. Then the insurrection is subdued by swift punishment. The judgment of the devil follows, whose power now forever ceases,—and also that of men. But with this judgment of persons is connected the destruction of the entire order of nature hitherto. The old earth, the theater of so many human and demoniac abominations, and even the old heaven, that stands so nearly allied with the history of the earth, pass away. The abode hitherto of those dead that were not raised at the first resurrection—that is, the dominion of death, *hades*—meets its end in the final abode of the damned, in the lake of fire. In the place of the old world, that has passed away, come a new earth and a new heaven. Upon this new earth comes the New Jerusa-

lem down from the invisible, celestial world, so that now the distinction between the visible and the invisible ceases, and God reigns in visible glory on the earth. With the description of this glory of the habitation of God among men, the Revelation of St. John closes.

"These are the clear contents, as they lie on the surface, of the section of chapters xix to xxii. We see what a firm, unbroken connection reigns here. Nothing can here be taken away, nothing transferred to another place," etc.

Such is the author's exposition of this important section of the Apocalypse. On the question of the return of the Jews to Palestine, and their conversion, the idea of our author is, not that the Jews will be gathered in the Holy Land, and there converted *by* the second coming of Christ, but that the Jews will first be converted by the same process and power as other people; will be, because of and after their conversion, gathered home to Jerusalem, and *then* the Lord will come and establish there a *Christian* empire. Then and there, at Christ's appearing to the already converted Jews, will they cry, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!" so fulfilling the prediction of Christ made to the Jews, Luke xiii, 35:

"When shall the grace of the Messiah's visible presence be again granted to the Jews? Then, when they shall say, 'Blessed is he that comes in the name of the Lord!' This was the cry with which Israel honored and hailed its king, when he showed himself to his people; just as, two days before, the enthusiastic multitude, at the entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem, greeted him of whom Zechariah says, 'Thou, daughter of Zion, rejoice; and shout, thou daughter of Jerusalem!' If one day the Jewish nation will thus greet the Lord, it will be a token of its conversion.

"The fact that the Lord will only then come again when Israel is converted, and that he will come to Israel, shows that the kingdom which he will establish, will be in special relation to this people, and be fixed in its midst. For this very reason, Christ will not come to erect his kingdom until Israel is converted."

The important question, "*How* will Israel be converted?"—a question that rises immediately in the mind when we hear of this great conversion of Jews—the author does not essay to answer particularly. The idea that Israel will be converted like any other people—that is, that many will only yield an external adhesion to Christ—he rejects. He says:

"This view is not in harmony with the words of the apostle. It is said, '*All* Israel will be saved.' Wherever in the New Testament the word '*saved*' occurs, it signifies more than external Christianization. In the sense of the apostle, there is no salvation but by means of true faith. Compare, for example, Eph. ii, 8: 'By grace are ye saved, through faith.' A mere external Christianization of any totality of men occurs nowhere in the New Testament. . . . When Paul says, Rom. xi, 'All Israel will be saved,' it means nothing else than that Israel will, in the future, become what the Church of Ephesus was in the day of the apostle Paul, when he could say to it, 'You have been saved by faith.' In other words, all Israel will, in the last times, become a congregation of true believers—will there be converted in a different sense from that of the conversion hitherto of other peoples. Were it otherwise, how then could the conversion of Israel be such a great blessing to the Christian world? (Compare Rom. xi, 12, 15.) The Christianization of any other people would be of precisely the same importance to the Church as that of the Jews. How thorough will be the future repentance of *this* people, is shown Zech. xii, 10-14; how complete its change of heart, is shown Ezek. xxxvi, 26, 27; xxxix, 29—according to which, Israel, after its conversion, will live in a state of true righteousness and glory, so that God will never need again to hide his face from them." (Pages 80-81.)

From the book we can not judge that the author means to teach that any other than the common means of the Gospel will bring the Jews to this conversion; but still the ever-recurring question, *How* and *why* shall Israel be so wonderfully converted, as no other people will? is not clearly answered here, if answered at all. The author satisfies himself that it will so be done; and if the Scripture teaches this, of course the fact must be accepted.

It is certainly to the no common credit of our author that he does not lose and waste himself, as so many have done, in idle attempts to fix in our world-chronology the "times," the A. D., of these wonderful events. While we may not agree with him in some of his views, we can not but read with interest and profit his earnest and intelligent efforts to give a sober, Scriptural exposition of the passages of the Old and New Testaments that speak of the final end of all things. The understanding of the events of the "last days" must ever be of transcendent interest to Christians.

REVIEW.

Theologische Studien und Kritiken. Viertes Heft. 1872. Gotha: T. A. Perthes.

THE last number of this solid theological German quarterly comes to us early. It opens with the announcement of the death of Dr. C. Bernhard Hundeshagen, one of Germany's eminent Protestant theologians, and for a long time one of the foremost editors of this quarterly. The brief notice speaks of him as "a theologian of tried faithfulness in the courageous devotion to the Gospel, of profound learning, and large-hearted freedom of mind, who had gained a deep insight into the nature of German Protestantism and its importance for the general life of our nation."

This number is well-freighted. Under the head of "Precensions," we have an elaborate review, by Kamphausen, of "The Pentateuch in the Speaker's Bible," and another of "Logos Spermaticos," by Engelhardt.

Of the "Speaker's Bible," the Pentateuch, Dr. Kamphausen says:

"With pleasure we see by means of this work the original text made more accessible to the readers of the English Bible than has hitherto been the case. What has been gained in this respect is worthy of praise. We are sorry to say, however, that our judgment is much more unfavorable of the exegetical worth of the Commentary. This, to say it in one word, rejects the scientific character altogether, inasmuch as it is throughout devoted to a system of false apologetics. This, however, by no means destroys the entire value of the Commentary."

Those familiar with German criticism and exegesis will understand what is here meant by "scientific character" and "false apologetics." Without these, German criticism would be "Hamlet" with Hamlet's part left out.

